MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
JANUARY 17, 1962

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley
Felix W. de Weldon
Peter Hurd
Douglas W. Orr
William G. Perry
Michael Rapuano
Ralph Walker

L. R. Wilson, Secretary
Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Susan E. Bennett, Admin. Secretary
Gilbert Halasz, Recorder

I. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Planning Commission
Anacostia Park - Proposed Reclamation and Redevelopment

Mr. Ellis Price, Chief Federal Planner for the Planning Commission met with the Commission to discuss recent developments concerning a proposed plan for the reclamation and redevelopment of Anacostia Park.

Mr. Price explained that inasmuch as he had outlined the plan in detail to the Commission at its meeting on December 19, 1961 he would not repeat his presentation again. He stated that the plan was to be regarded as a general policy plan and that the details of landscaping improvements, new facilities, etc. would be developed in the future if the policy plan were approved. He noted that the Planning Commission had approved the plan and that it would be submitted to the Board of Commissioners in the near future.

The members of the Commission commended Mr. Price for his work in the preparation of the plan and, after some discussion of the proposed road system in the park, voted to approve it.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter for the Chairman's signature setting forth the Commission's approval. EXHIBIT A

2. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission
Proposed Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial

The Commission met with Mr. Francis Biddle, Chairman of the

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission and Mr. William Pederson, architect, of the firm of Pederson and Tilney, winners of the Memorial competition, to discuss the proposed design of the memorial selected by the Memorial Commission. Accompanying Mr. Biddle were Mr. Pietro Belluschi, architect, Mr. Edmund Purves, architect, Mr. Phillip Johnson, architect, and Mr. Douglas Haskell, editor of Architectural Forum. Also present were Mr. C. Paul Jennewein, President, National Sculpture Society, Mr. John Harbeson, President, National Academy of Design, Mrs. James Rowe, Chairman, Mr. William E. Finley, Director, Mr. Walter Louchheim, member, of the National Capital Planning Commission, and Rear Admiral Neil Phillips (ret.) Chairman, Committee of 100 on the Federal City, American Planning and Civic Association.

In his introductory remarks Mr. Biddle explained some of the history of the Memorial Commission, the selection of the site by a committee of architects, the competition to select a design for the memorial, and the basis of the approval of the winning design by the Memorial Commission. The members were then shown color slides and a short movie of a model of the design.

Mr. Walker then offered five questions which he requested Mr. Biddle, and the other witnesses speaking in favor of the design, to answer. These questions were:

1. Considering the recollection of Judge Felix Frankfurter as to Franklin Roosevelt's own concept of a memorial similar to that at Hyde Park and designed by him, wherein is this design thought appropriate to his life and memory?

2. In what way will it enhance his reputation?

3. Why is this memorial thought appropriate to this site and in relation to the other memorials which it equals in height or exceeds, except the Washington Monument?

4. Why is concrete thought to be an appropriate material as belonging to something which should endure?

5. Why should the word "contemporary" be thought as necessary to enhance the capital of the United States?

Mr. Biddle, Mr. Pederson, Mr. Belluschi, Mr. Purves, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Haskell, speaking in favor of the proposed design, attempted to answer one or more of these questions.

Thereafter, Messrs. Harbeson, Jennewein, and Admiral Phillips spoke in opposition to the proposed design.

The transcript of the meeting containing the statements made by the above-named persons is included herein as EXHIBIT B. B-1 to 5.

After the guests had departed the members discussed the design in executive session. In their discussion two problems were paramount - the design itself and the technical problems involved in constructing the monolithic slabs in concrete. Some of the members were of the opinion that the design could be modified in such a way as to make it harmonious with the Lincoln, Washington and Jefferson Memorials, but there was a general agreement that as presented the memorial was out of scale with those monuments. They also recognized that the problem of a successful solution to the technical difficulties involved in executing the stelae in concrete was a factor which required their serious consideration. It was concluded that before reaching any decision the members should individually study these problems in the coming month in order to be prepared to discuss the matter again at the February meeting. They asked that the Chairman invite the architect, Mr. Pederson, and Mr. Norman Hoberman, sculptor, to meet with the Commission on Tuesday, February 20th, to discuss the design in Executive session. EXHIBIT C

II DISCUSSION

1. Resolution on the Formation of Ad Hoc Committees

The members expressed their concern about the formation of a number of ad hoc committees such as the so-called "Little Fine Arts Committee" created by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic to advise on the design of highway projects, and the Fine Arts Committee on the White House which was created to advise on the redecoration of the White House, and others. Some of the members felt that these committees were confusing to the public and that they tended to undermine the authority of the Commission.

The following resolution was proposed:

> "In light of the appointment by governmental agencies of advisory bodies to make recommendations regarding the design and appearance of the City of Washington in such matters as the White House, the proposed Freeway system, public buildings fronting on Lafayette Square, and other areas, where the advice of the Commission is consequently disregarded, the Commission of Fine Arts, as the only official fine arts commission authorized by Congress, wish to submit to the President and the Bureau of the Budget that the acceptance of the opinions of such bodies results in weakening the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts."

In the discussion that followed, the Chairman suggested that inclusion of the White House in the resolution might prove embarrassing to the President and to the Commission and requested that mention of the White House be eliminated. The majority of the members agreed and the resolution was changed accordingly. The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter forwarding the resolution to the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Held for further consideration at the 7 February 2 Mtg. 9/2/62 sev EXHIBIT D

2. Board of Commissioners Budget Statement to Congress

The Chairman read to the members a statement in a recent report to Congress prepared by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia entitled "State of the Nation's Capital 1962" to the effect that -

> "The Fine Arts Commission and National Capital Planning Commission require that most public works structures be designed to harmonize with the Federal Master Plan for the Capital City. It is estimated that the structure of the new Theodore Roosevelt Bridge will cost 2.5 million dollars or 33% extra, because of this."

The members thoroughly disagreed with the evaluation of 2.5 million dollars in extra costs for the Roosevelt Bridge. They surmised that this evaluation, like the $2,500 light standards discussed the day before, was based upon unrealistic appraisals, and disregard of the Commission's recommendations. They unanimously agreed that statements of this sort by the District Government should not be allowed to go unchallenged. Therefore, the members approved a motion that the Chairman write to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget protesting the statement in the Board of Commissioners' report to Congress. It was also suggested that Mr. Harold Aitken, Director of Highways and Traffic, be asked to attend a meeting of the Commission to discuss the Highway Department's basis of appraisal of the cost of highway projects submitted to the Commission for its advice. EXHIBIT E

Thereafter, at 1:00 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C.L. Martin, Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 JANUARY 1962

AM

9:30 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:35 a. National Capital Planning Commission
(Mr. Ellis Price, Chief, Federal Planning Division, National Capital Planning Commission)

Anacostia Park - Proposed Reclamation and Redevelopment

10:00 b. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission
(Honorable Francis Biddle, Chairman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Mr. Philip C. Johnson, architect, Mr. William F. Pederson, architect, Mr. Edmund Purves, architect, Mr. Pietro Belluschi, architect, Mr. Douglas Haskell, Editor, Architectural Forum, Mr. John Harbeson, President, National Academy of Design, Mr. C. Paul Jennewein, President, National Sculpture Society, Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, Chairman, Committee of 100 on the Federal City.)

26 January 1962

Dear Mrs. Rowe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on January 17th, conferred with Mr. Ellis Price of the National Capital Planning Commission staff, regarding the revised plans for the reclamation and redevelopment of the Anacostia River and flats.

Mr. Price explained that plans prepared in 1924 would have provided a greater emphasis on water, including islands, lakes and so forth. Since that time, however, the area has gradually deteriorated. Fill from the East Capitol Street Bridge and Stadium area has intruded irregularly into the lower part of the lake, and the river itself has become more heavily silted. The original plan was no longer thought to be feasible.

Instead, it is intended that the size of Lake Kingman would be further reduced, especially south of Benning Road, where the former islands around the Burnham Barrier would be joined to the main Stadium area. Other features of the plan included additional park-type roadways, and a new marina to be situated on the bank of the Anacostia River to replace boating facilities originally intended for Kingman Lake.

The members of the Commission had always hoped to see this park retained as a more naturalistic area, but realize that the present condition of the river precluded such treatment. They therefore approved the revised proposals. Not only would the appearance of the area be enhanced, but the new design would provide additional space in an area of the city much in need of a park of this type. Traffic circulation would also be improved, having been so arranged as to avoid detracting from park activities.

The Commission is encouraged to see plans for this area moving ahead, and will be interested to review the details for landscaping roads, when these are available. We hope this will not be too far in the future.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr.
Chairman
National Capital Planning Commission
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Room 7000

New Interior Building

Washington, D. C.

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 o'clock, a.m., Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

David E. Finley

Michael Rapuano

Ralph W. Walker

William G. Perry

Felix W. de Weldon

Peter Hurd

Douglas W. Orr,

Members

L. R. Wilson, Secretary and Administrative Officer

Messrs. Atherton and Martin, Staff Members.

Exhibit B - January 17, 1962

Exhibit B - January 17, 1962

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Shall we come to order, ladies and gentlemen?

I would like to say first of all that we are delighted to have so many distinguished persons here to help the Fine Arts Commission come to a conclusion as to what we should advise about the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

I am particularly glad to have Mr. Biddle, the chairman, and Mr. Pederson.

I would like to say that the Commission of Fine Arts is well aware of the enormous amount of effort and time that has gone on the part of the Memorial Commission, the advisory commission, into arriving at a conclusion which they bring to us this morning.

I would particularly like to welcome Pietro Belluschi, who is accustomed to sitting with us in this room in other years, and all other distinguished persons who are here.

I think all of your know Mrs. Rowe who is Chairman of the National Planning Commission, who has come over to sit with us and hear the discussions this morning, and also Mr. Louchheim who is a member of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Biddle, would you like to make the statement and then perhaps after you have made an opening statement, would you like to have the slides and movies?

CHAIRMAN KINLEY: Shall we come to order, ladies and gentlemen?

I would like to say first of all that we are delighted to have so many distinguished persons here to help the Fine Arts Commission come to a conclusion as to what we should advise about the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

I am particularly glad to have Mr. Bidlack, the chairman, and Mr. Pedersen.

I would like to say that the Commission of Fine Arts is well aware of the enormous amount of effort and time that has gone on the part of the Memorial Commission, the advisory commission, into arriving at a conclusion which they bring to us this morning.

I would particularly like to welcome Pietro Belluschi, who is accustomed to sitting with us in this room in other years, and all other distinguished persons who are here.

I think all of your know Mrs. Rowe who is Chairman of the National Planning Commission, who has come over to sit with us and hear the discussions this morning, and also Mr. Longnecker who is a member of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bidlack, would you like to make the statement and then perhaps after you have made an opening statement, would you like to have the slides and movies?

MR. BIDDLE: I think that is a very good idea, David, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then we could hear other people.

MR. BIDDLE: That would be fine.

May I just say one thing:

I am so afraid -- these brochures are very valuable and very few left -- I had to borrow copies from the members of our commission, so would you mind giving them to David when you get through?

Do any of you need another?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We had six, so we passed the six around among seven.

MR. BIDDLE: I had a feeling you had one, but I didn't have one at the time.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I will lend mine to Mrs. Rowe.

If you have another one, could we have it for the files? If we could have seven, they could use mine for the file copy. Is that possible?

MR. BIDDLE: I will give you this.

I don't know if you want it or not. This is a copy of the program under which the competition was held -- not terribly important -- I thought you might want to read it.

There are also a few of these. I have seven of these.

them.

There are also a few of these. I have seven of
particularly important -- I thought you might want to read it.
of the program under which the competition was held -- not
I don't know if you want it or not. This is a copy

MR. BLOOMER: I will give you this.

file copy. Is that possible?

files? If we could have seven, they could use mine for the

If you have another one, could we have it for the

CHAIRMAN PICKLE: I will lend mine to Mrs. Howe.

didn't have one at the time.

MR. BLOOMER: I had a feeling you had one, but I

around among seven.

CHAIRMAN PICKLE: We had six, so we passed the six

Do any of you need another?

David when you get through?

evidence of our committee, so would you mind getting them to

able and very few left -- I had to borrow copies from the

I am so afraid -- these brochures are very valu-

May I just say one thing:

MR. MINSHALL: That would be fine.

CHAIRMAN PICKLE: Then we could hear other people.

David, etc.

MR. MINSHALL: I notice that is a very good item,

There are a few of these admirable photographs announcing two possible competitors, with a little statement.

Shall I go ahead, then?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. BIDDLE: As a preliminary, I want to say something about the background of the competition.

In the first place, with respect to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission, it was appointed in 1955.

It was slow in organizing, first because nobody was chairman under the resolution; nobody liked to start it.

Finally, John W. McCormack got them together after six or eight months.

Then a long time went by in which various schemes were planned.

The present Commission -- I should say the Commission consists of twelve persons. There is one vacancy now. There are four Senators, four Members of the House, and four individuals appointed by the President.

There are only three Senators now, Javits and Case, Republicans from New York and New Jersey, respectively; four members of the House. Jimmy Roosevelt, to start with, who was just appointed by the Speaker when John McCormack became Speaker, he thought it was wiser not to have him go on, although there were precedents which I urged on him, but he

There are a few of those terribly precocious

announcing his possible candidacy, with a little statement.

Shall I go ahead, then?

DELEGATE KENNEY: Yes.

MR. SIMMS: As a preliminary, I want to say some-

thing about the background of the competition.

In the first place, with respect to the Franklin

Delano Roosevelt Constabulary, it was appointed in 1933.

It was slow in organizing, first because nobody was

clairvoyant under the revolutionary mouldy lifted to steer it.

Finally, John McCormack got them together after

six or eight months.

Then a long time went by in which various schemes

were planned.

The present Commission -- I should say the Com-

mission consists of twelve persons. There is one vacancy

now. There are four Senators, four Members of the House, and

five individuals appointed by the President.

There are only three Senators now, Davis and Vase,

Republicans from New York and New Jersey, respectively; four

members of the House. Tammy Roosevelt, to start with, who

was first appointed by the Speaker -- the Speaker, John Nance Garner,

Speaker, he thought it was wiser not to have him go on,

although there were pressures that I urged on him, but he

thought he wouldn't do it -- Jimmy Roosevelt, Mrs. St. George, Paul Schenck, Mrs. St. George and Paul Schenck are both Respublicans. I say this really to show you how little, how no politics got into this.

So I am emphasizing the fact that there was a possibility for politics by stating who these people were.

And then Mr. James H. Rowe, myself, and Rosenberg in New York, and Clark Clifford. That makes it up, eleven.

We met last Thursday and voted nine to one -- I held down Anna Rosenberg's proxy -- she wasn't there -- nine to one in favor of the Commission.

The one vote against it was Mr. Schenck who said he didn't like it and wouldn't vote for it. That was that.

It is interesting that there you have all the Republicans and Democrats on it.

From the beginning, let me emphasize this because it goes into a larger feature; there have been absolutely no politics in this from the very beginning. One condition was affixed to it, to the resolution.

When I say "it" I mean the resolution approving the award. That was that a medallion or statue of President Roosevelt should be added.

Mr. Pederson who testified before the Commission said that they had discussed it at my request for some time

and considered it very carefully, suggested to us two or three places where a statue could well go, suggested the alternative of a medallion on one of the great stele.

Of course, we were not able to do anything further on that.

Indeed, the completion of the study and recommendation would be quite expensive. I would hesitate to see it.

It seems to me a detail in the large sense that your Commission, I am sure, will be able to pass on the model and designs without considering that, but I assure you that any such change by way of having a sculpture would come before you in the usual course of business.

That is the form it would probably take.

Now let me go back a moment to the way this was done. The reason I am going back is my great emphasis on the professional manner in which the Government has been able to conduct this very important competition and study.

Lawrence Lowell, who taught Government at Harvard, who was later President of it, said, "Democracy will be judged by its ability to use experts."

I don't think it is necessary for me to emphasize how often the Government disregards its use of experts, so that the great importance of this competition, I think, is that, first, not knowing what to do, and after looking at

and confidence in very generally, suggested to me one or
three plans where a nation could well go, suggested the
alternative of a modification on one of the great ideals.
Of course, we were not able to do anything further
on that.

Indeed, the completion of the study and recommendation would be quite expensive. I would hesitate to say it.
It seems to me a detail in the large scope that
your Commission, I am sure, will be able to pass on the
model was design without considering that), but I realize the
that any such change by way of having a sculpture would come
before you in the usual course of business.

That is the form it would probably take.

Now let me go back a moment to the way this was
done. The reason I am going back is my great emphasis on
the professional manner in which the Government has been able
to conduct this very important competition and study.

Lawrence Durell, who brought Government at Bargain,
who was later President of it, said, "Democracy will be
judged by its ability to use experts."

I don't think it is necessary for me to emphasize
how often the Government disregards its use of experts, so
that the great importance of this competition, I think, is
that, first, not knowing what to do, and after looking at

several sites as a committee, ad a Commission, we then asked Mr. Belluschi to organize with us, with the Chairman, a committee of seven architects.

They included Lewis Mumford and others.

(Mr. Biddle read the names of the committee.)

The decision was unanimous. They recommended this site as not only the best site, but the only site in which an appropriate memorial could be raised to President Roosevelt's memory in central Washington, to put him out of the central life of this city they felt would be unworthy and they examined, I think, five sites that were chosen from the dozen that we first suggested, that we have seen.

Now, I think the second thing that is important in connection with this work was that they also felt that this was an exceedingly difficult problem for an architect, first because he could not copy anything that was already there, to have another Greek or Roman design, or even a very ancient Egyption design would be intolerable.

Yet, it had to be of the kind of monumentality, kind of strength and vitality that would not be warped by the designs, nor must it overplace them.

So I think that Mr. Belluschi will probably say this is about the same height at the Lincoln but obviously didn't touch the Washington Monument.

(Mr. Biddle read the names of the committee.)

The decision was unanimous. They recommended this site as not only the best site, but the only site in which an appropriate memorial could be raised to President Roosevelt's memory in central Washington, to put him out of the central life of this city they felt would be unworthy and they examined, I think, five sites that were chosen from the dozen that we first suggested, that we have seen.

Now, I think the second thing that is important in connection with this work was that they also felt that this was an exceedingly difficult problem for an architect, first because he could not copy anything that was already there, to have another Greek or Roman design, or even a very natural adaptation design would be intolerable.

Yet, it had to be of the kind of monumentality, kind of strength and vitality that would not be warped by the design, memorial overpower them.

So I think that Mr. Bellucci will probably say this is about the same height as the Lincoln but obviously different than the Washington Monument.

If you tower up beyond a certain point, it was very carefully thought out.

If this is to take the form of a monument, certainly the place has been selected by Congress with a unanimous vote two years ago, that something different and something new must be done.

There were 574 entrants. The competition was highly placed by all the architects. I cannot help emphasizing the fact that when the Government uses the best men they can get, that great and careful consideration should be given to that, even if there are differences of opinion as to whether it is liked or not liked.

That fact was a very important one.

Of course, I do not need to suggest that it would exclude a decision, an adverse decision, for a moment, but it had, very interestingly, great effect with us.

Mrs. St. George would say: "If that is the recommendation of the architects and this committee, we should follow it." That has run through the whole thing.

Now, that movement was not new, of course, there have been recently competitions for Government locations -- for instance, one of the ones I remember most recently is the chancery in London in which they had a competition and which the Government was actually bound by the result of the

which the Government was actually bound by the result of the
enquiry in London in which they had a competition and
for instance, one of the ones I remember most recently is
-- have been recently applications for appointments in
now, that movement was not new, of course, there
follow it." That has run through the whole thing.
mendation of the architects and this committee, we should
Mrs. St. George would say: "If that is the recom-
but, very importantly, have differ with me.
of course, I do not need to suggest that it would
exclude a decision, an adverse decision, for a moment, but it
to whether it is liked or not liked.
That fact was a very important one.
given to that, even if there are differences of opinion as
they can get, that great and careful consideration should be
ding the fact that when the Government uses the best men
highly placed by all the architects. I cannot help empha-
There were 5?4 entrants. The competition was
ment be done.
two years ago, that concerning offices and something was
the place has been replaced by something with a marvellous vis
If just to take the form of a monument, certainly
very reasonably thought out.

jury's choice, like an ordinary competition among individual architects.

We, however, under the rules of the Institute, put in a clause which we felt necessary, not binding the Government here in this case. We thought that would be unfair both to our Commission and to your Commission, and because it would have been a contractual obligation on the Government.

Therefore, the field is entirely open.

Nevertheless, I emphasize my point.

Let me say because you think all these things absolutely enter into a consideration, this consideration isn't purely an artistic consideration because I think other emotional things necessarily come into a memorial.

I want to say something about the opposition -- first, that it should be useful, a useful memorial.

Well, that meant tacking a name onto a hospital.

The Commission in the very early days, our commission, when it was suggested that they should go in for a cultural center, before the Cultural Center had been developed, or was suggested to a diplomatic school, felt that that was not what Congress meant by a monument; that we should follow what Congress had meant.

Nor, indeed, did it mean anything to Wilson to do that.

jury's choice, like an ordinary competition among individual architects.

We, however, under the rules of the Institute, set in a clause which we felt necessary, not binding the Government here in this case. We thought that would be unfair both to the Commission and to your commission, and because it would have been a contractual obligation on the Government.

Therefore, the field is entirely open.

Nevertheless, I emphasize my point.

Let me say because you think all these things absolutely enter into consideration, that consideration isn't purely an artistic consideration because I think other emotional things necessarily come into a memorial.

I want to say something about the opposition -- first, that it should be useful, a useful memorial.

Well, that means locating a name onto a hospital.

The Commission in the very early days, our commission, when it was suggested that they should go in for a cultural center, before the Cultural Center had been developed or was suggested to a diplomatic accord, felt that that was not what Congress meant by a monument; that we should follow what Congress had meant.

Nor, indeed, did it mean anything to Wilson to do that.

I might remind you at the same time that all those who said that the form of the monument, and many of the critics did, should take the place of an open park instead of a monument, neglected the fact that this is a park, one feature of a park, one of four great monuments joined together by the natural location of the design and the river and the outstanding monument, and by a series of footpaths which would combine all of them into an appropriate parking spaces.

Those things are perhaps minor, but they form part of the picture.

Of course, many, many of the critics came from papers, particularly in the Washington Post last Sunday, had an editorial which was made up of verses about Roosevelt's failures and ending, of course, each one of these steles stands perhaps for one of his faults -- that kind of cheap stuff which is very unfair, so that I am glad now that this is in the hands of a group of professionals and not the kind of stuff that goes up whenever a monument is erected.

Jefferson went through the same period.

Now, just a word -- show, then, the suggestion about the living memorial. That means something that you can use, I suppose, but is the Lincoln Memorial less living because it takes the form of a monument and you can't use it?

because it takes the form of a monument and you can't use it
can use," I suppose, but in the Lincoln Memorial Jane Living
about the living memorial. That means something that you
Now," just a word -- now," then," the suggestion
Jefferson went through the same period,
of stuff that goes up whenever a monument is erected.
is in the hands of a group of professionals and not the kind
stuff which is very nuts," so that I am glad now that this
stands perhaps for one of his faults -- that kind of cheap
fatuous unction," of course," and one of those Victor
an editorial which was made up of verses about Roosevelt's
peare," particularly in the Washington Post Jane Bundy," had
of," of course," many of the critics even those
of the pictures.

Those things are perhaps minor," but they form part
mption would combine all of them into an choreographic parking
and the overwhelming monument," and by a series of footpaths
gether by the natural location of the design and the river
feature of a park," one of four great monuments joined co-
of a monument," neglected the fact that it is a park," and
critics did," should take the place of an open park joined
those who would make the Lincoln Memorial," and many of the
I might remind you at the same time that all

I don't think the day of monuments is gone. I think we should have fewer of them and better. I think this will complete it physically.

Just let me say one other thing and then I am finished. Perhaps I have taken up too muchtime already.

I think that the professionals point it out -- Mr. Haskell who will testify later will be able to tell you later, as he is the editor of the Progressive, The Architectural Record, of that situation -- but I followed most of the professional reaction.

Seward at Harvard, and Tom Crane of Progressive Architecture -- Bruno Zavy, have expressed themselves in an extraordinary article about it -- William Lesgas and Philip Will.

Will has asked me to introduce this letter. He wanted to be here but could not.

I think without reading at length -- I quote briefly from it, and then pass it up to the chairman -- He says:

"Speaking as an individual, I wish to go further" --

He mentioned the approval of the Institute --

"Speaking as an individual, I wish to go further. In my considered opinion, the design by Pederson has great dignity and vitality. It possesses true monumentality without

I don't think the sky of comments is gone. I think we should have fewer of them and better. I think this will complete it physically.

Just let me say one other thing and then I am finished. Perhaps I have taken up too much time already.

I think that the professionals point it out -- Mr. Peskoff who will testify later will be able to tell you later, as he is the editor of the Progressive, The Architectural Record, of that distinction -- but I followed most of the professional reaction.

Seward at Harvard, and Tome Grone of Progressive Architecture -- Bruno Zevi, have expressed themselves in an extraordinary article about it -- William Leggea and Philip Will.

Will has asked me to introduce this letter. He wanted to be here but could not.

I think without reading it again -- I quote briefly from it, and then pass it up to the chairman -- He says:

"Speaking as an individual, I wish to go further." --

He mentioned the approval of the Institute --

"Speaking as an individual, I wish to go further. In my considered opinion, the design by Pedersen has great dignity and vitality. It possesses such uncommonly strong

the overpowering concentration of symmetry.

"The originality of its conception encompasses and encircles the beholder as he walks about within the group of stele, brings a new experience to memorial architecture."

I think I have nothing more to say, except let me add my gratitude to the Chairman for his extended courtesy all through this period of the Commission, otherwise of our chance to come before you and at my pleasure in being able to see such a distinguished group.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Biddle.

We are all glad to be of help in any way that we can.

I meant to say in my opening remarks that as soon as we knew we were coming to us this morning I wrote a letter to Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt and asked if it would be possible for her to be with us today, too, or any of the family. She is not here so I take it it was impossible, but we would like very much to have had her.

MR. BIDDLE: Anna is very keen about it and and Jimmy voted for it. Mrs. Roosevelt sort of keeps out of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Also, I had a letter from Wallace Harrison which you might like to read. It came this morning. You spoke of hoping to have him here. It wasn't possible for him to come but he sent this letter.

the overpowering concentration of expenditure.

"The objective of the Commission, therefore, and
ought to be, to make room within the group of
essential, things now objectionable to governmental architecture."

I think I have nothing more to say, except let me
add my gratitude to the Chairman for the extended courtesy
all through this period of the Commission, otherwise of our
chance to come before you and be my pleasure to bring this to
some kind of distinguished group.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Biddle.

We are all glad to be of help in any way that we
can.

I meant to say in my opening remarks that as soon
as we knew we were coming to us this morning I wrote a letter
to Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt and asked if it would be possible
for her to be with us today, too, or any of the family. She
is not here so I take it it was impossible, but we would like
very much to have had her.

MR. BIDDLE: Mona is very keen about it and
Jimmy voted for it. Mrs. Roosevelt sort of keeps out of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Also, I had a letter from Wallace
Harrison which you might like to read. It came this morning.
You spoke of hoping to have him here. It wasn't possible for
him to come but he sent this letter.

MR. BIDDLE: Would you like me to read this?

(Mr. Biddle read the letter referred to.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I also talked to him and told him we would be delighted.

MR. BIDDLE: He just says, "I am therefore forwarding this note in support for the memorial proposed by Pederson and Associates as picked by the properly constituted jury. I think it is a fine scheme and believe it should be allowed to be built."

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I might say I have had quite a lot of letters both pro and con. I will not take the time to read them all, but they are all part of the record.

Would you like to have the slides before we hear from anyone so we will have the benefit of seeing the slides?

MR. BIDDLE: I leave that to you entirely, sir.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to start those now?

MR. HOPPENFELD: The only reason we are showing the slides and a very brief film is that during the study of the model in our offices, many people came to see it and, as in most cases, a model is really not intended to be seen from above.

In this particular case, everyone recognized that it was the kind of thing that was to be experienced at high

read them all, but they are all part of the record.

lot of letters coming and can. I will not take the time to

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I might say I have had quite a

allowed to be built."

ing this route in support for the memorial presented by
Federation and associates as stated by the properly constituted
jury. I think it is a fine scheme and believe it should be

MR. RIDDLE: He just says, "I am therefore forward-

me would be delighted.

(Mr. Riddle read the letter referred to.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I also talked to him and told him

MR. RIDDLE: Would you like me to read that?

was the kind of thing that was to be experienced at night

as moving through it. This was very difficult to do with the model.

Therefore, we tried to simulate this experience in motion through the use of slides.

Then we actually had a camerman come in and with the zoomar lens to try to simulate the experience as one might enjoy it on the ground. That is the purpose of these slides.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Hoppenfeld. We are very glad to see them; also very glad to see the model because I think the architects are very much addicted to models when they can get them.

MR. HOPPENFELD: This first slide, of course, is just an overall view of the central area and the area shaded in green is the general area that was under consideration.

(Other slides were shown.)

(Other slides were shown.)

MR. HOPPENFELD: Further attempt was made to simulate the changes in the quality of the light as the sun would create shadows and shade, which again the model would not have under ordinary room light.

We have a short film that attempts to do the same thing.

(Showing of film.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Hoppenfeld.

I am sorry we could not get the room darker, but it is the best we could do. Thank you very much for showing them.

Would you like to have Mr. Pederson speak next?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest something just to keep the thing going on some sort of similar line, that we might ask the people who are testifying before us to speak to some questions that we have had in our minds?

The first one, considering the recollection of Judge Frankfurther as to FDR's own concept of a memorial to him, one similar to that at Hyde Park and designed by him -- wherein is this design thought appropriate to his life and memory.

MR. BIDDLE: I am very glad that you asked that. I do not think the nature of the design should depend on the man who has died and in whose memory it is being put up. Remember, Jefferson said he wanted his name simply as

President and founder of the University. There is the Jefferson Memorial.

I think it is the people that survive him and loved him who are the ones who ought to say what in their feeling and their traditions they think would more easily bring back to them and their children the quality of his greatness.

Mrs. Roosevelt feels that, too.

MR. WALKER: That I am going to ask, the second question:

In what way will it enhance his reputation?

MR. BIDDLE: I think living symbols bring back memories of the greatness. I have a feeling that the thousands of people who go through the Lincoln Memorial and look at those extraordinary, wonderful lines inscribed on it, feel deeply moved and deeply unified in one of the great traditions of our country which is the Lincoln tradition.

It is the greatest of all of them, certainly greater than Jefferson or any of them.

I think if you feel as those who wish the monument to be erected, and apparently that is the desire of all the Members of the Congress -- if you feel that, thenI think you might share my feeling that a memorial of that kind which would recreate a tradition of greatness, although you could not define it in ordinary words, it stirs you to memory of

not define it in ordinary words, it exists for us to memory of
would represent a tradition of greatness, although you could
might share my feeling that a memorial of that kind which
Members of the Congress -- if you feel that, then I think you
to be erected, and apparently that is the desire of all the
I think if you feel as those who wish the monument

than Jefferson or any of them.

It is the greatest of all of them, certainly greater

traditions of our country which is the Lincoln tradition.

feel deeply moved and deeply uplifted in one of the great

look at those extraordinary, wonderful lines inscribed on it,

thousands of people who go through the Lincoln Memorial and

memories of the greatness. I have a feeling that the

MR. BIDDLE: I think living symbols bring back

question:

In what way will it enhance his reputation?

MR. [illegible]: That I am going to ask, the second

to them and their children the quality of his greatness.

and their traditions they think would more easily bring back

him who are the ones who ought to say what in their feeling

I think it is the people that survive him and loved

Jefferson Memorial.

President and founder of the Democracy. There is the

unselfishness and greatness. That is the only way I can answer it. Perhaps it is inadequate.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would like to add to that that personally I agree with that sentiment. In the case of great men I like to have a monument that, when we see it, we think of them, not a useful memorial which we ourselves can profit by.

I think there is room for both, but in the case of great men, especially Washington, I think monuments are very important.

MR. BIDDLE: That is very interesting. It is the only place where they are really important in a sense.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Recognition, by a sense.

MR. BIDDLE: Millions of youngsters looking at that Lincoln ---

MR. WALKER: Why is this memorial thought appropriate to this site in relation to the other memorials which it equals in height or exceeds, except the Washington?

MR. BIDDLE: That is a very interesting question and Senator Javits at one of the committee meetings asked me the same question.

He said, "You think it will go with those other memorials?" And I, a little cautiously leading him along: "You mean architecturally?"

CHAIRMAN FINDLEY: I would like to add to that that personally I agree with that sentiment. In the case of Ernest man I like to have a monument that, when we see it, we think of them, not a useful memorial which we ourselves can profit by.

I think there is room for both, but in the case of Ernest man, especially Washington, I think monuments are very important.

MR. RIDDLE: That is very interesting. It is the only place where they are really important in a sense.

CHAIRMAN FINDLEY: Recognition, by a sense.

MR. RIDDLE: Millions of youngsters looking at that Lincoln ---

MR. WAIKER: Why is this memorial thought appropriate to this site in relation to the other memorials which it equals in height or exceeds, except the Washington?

MR. RIDDLE: That is a very interesting question and Senator Davis at one of the committee meetings asked me the same question.

He said, "You think it will go with those other memorials." And I, a little carelessly leaning back along: "You mean aesthetically."

He said, "You know very well I don't mean that. Is Roosevelt worthy to put with the other three great men?"

"I think, Senator, when the time comes to vote, you will vote that it is."

So when the time came to vote, he did.

Does that answer the question?

MR. WALKER: I would like each one of the men as they address themselves to answer the same questions -- probably build up an answer.

Then fourth, a question:

Why is concrete thought to be an appropriate material belonging to something which would have endurance?

MR. BIDDLE: That is a very interesting question, too. I am going to have Mr. Pederson speak of it. I dislike not answering questions. I am going to speak of it, too.

The estimates in this are about four and a quarter million, that you should put up ten per cent, I am told. Wouldn't that be about right, Mr. Harbeson, five per cent a year in increased estimates?

Concrete is not altogether satisfactory. It is cheaper and Mr. Pederson will tell you its advantages.

My own information is to recommend to the Commission when I come to those important but still minor considerations, but very important -- I am glad you raised it -- to permit us

"I think, Senator, when the time comes to vote, you will vote that it is."

So when the time came to vote, he did.

Does that answer the question?

MR. MALONE: I would like seen one of the men as they address themselves to [illegible] the question -- probably [illegible] answer.

Then [illegible] question:

Why is concrete thought to be an appropriate material belonging to something which would have endurance?

MR. DODDS: That is a very interesting question, too. I am going to have Mr. Peterson speak of it. I dislike not answering questions. I am going to speak of it, too.

The estimates in this are about four and a quarter million, that you should put up ten per cent, I am told. Wouldn't that be about right, Mr. Peterson, five per cent a year in interest [illegible]?

Concrete is not altogether satisfactory. It is cheaper and Mr. Peterson will tell you its advantages.

My own information is to recommend to the Committee [illegible] but very important -- I am glad you raised it -- to permit us

to use marble which is a little cheaper than granite, or some marble composition if we can raise enough money, because I have to raise the money.

I like to go step by step.

If we cannot squeeze out of the public and the Congress enough to do the thing, I would prefer concrete to nothing, I think.

MR. WALKER: Then, without endeavoring in any way to imitate ancient Greece or ancient Rome, or even the University of Virginia, why is the word "contemporary" thought to be necessary to enhance the reputation of FDR?

MR. BIDDLE: I don't think it is necessary to enhance the reputation, although he was a very contemporary human being. But that wasn't the way in which it was viewed.

I think it is felt much more that America, which is still a young country in its traditions, has not for very many years shook itself free from the influence of Europe, just the way western museums have not altogether shaken themselves free from the great influence of eastern museums, and that a contemporary thing is important for that reason alone.

I do not mean contemporary in the sense of a year or two years but in what might be called in the midst of a movement, like the modern movement in architecture, if we can use a loose and not very meaningful term, on the whole,

that that period has established itself so firmly that you can now say that that is American and that the tradition of the past has been cut off, at least to the extent of putting another Roman or Greek monument there.

MR. WALKER: One last question, and that is again related more or less to the material, concrete.

You know, you were talking about our tie-up with Europe, using it for effect again, new emotions out of cruder materials. This is why it comes back to concrete again, as to whether a monument of this size can effectively be made of a material brutal in itself.

MR. BIDDLE: That something will happen to it?

MR. WALKER: Erode.

MR. BIDDLE: Crack.

I went into that very carefully with Mr. Pederson. There are two views of it.

I think from what he told me most recently, he has had his engineers go into that with greater care, that the chances were well over 90 per cent against cracking to the point of view where it would mar it.

I think that is a very important consideration, however, and I am not completely sold on any material. I am not competent to be sold in that field.

I think it is an excellent idea.

May I thank you for asking these questions because, having argued so many cases before the Supreme Court, if I am not interrupted by Justice Frankfurther I feel quite lost.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will be glad to hear from Mr. Pederson.

MR. PEDERSON: I am Mr. Pederson. I represent my partner.

We feel, first of all, grateful, gratified, to have won such a great competition. We very honestly feel that we have created a thoroughly appropriate and thoroughly dignified monument.

One of the conditions of the program was that this monument relate to the other two low monuments, the Lincoln and the Jefferson, and provide for free flow of pedestrian traffic from one to the other.

We think in the openness of the design, we have very well fulfilled that requirement.

As Judge Biddle said, this is a park, and this monument is a part of the park.

The other things that impelled us to place various quotations from the President's speeches on these stele was the fact that most of the President's great humanitarian ideas were promulgated in speeches, first promulgated in speeches to the public or to the Congress.

We think that as people come for many, many years to visit this monument and breathe the great words, they will be moved.

I think it has been imperfectly realized that this monument is a great piece of contemporary sculpture. Architecture is becoming more and more a plastic thing, less symmetrical, and it is my very firm belief that we have in this created, in this monument created a truly mid-twentieth-century art form.

To take up the question of material, we very honestly, Mr. Walker and members of the Commission, are of two minds about the material.

We have stayed with concrete and we are talking not about the raw, gray, naked concrete, but a very sophisticated concrete, if I may use that word, which would be made of very white quartz aggregate, of white cement and white sand, of extreme density, so its finished product would be denser than marble or denser than limestone which would be bush hammered to give it the maximum sparkle and to hide whatever surface imperfections resulted from the building of the monument.

The concrete would be very hard and we are assured by our engineers, Emmett Whitney -- I talked to other structural engineers -- that we would have no cracking or spalling.

We think that as people come for many, many years to visit this country and observe the great work, they will be moved.

I think it has been imperfectly realised that this monument is a great piece of contemporary sculpture. Architecture is becoming more and more a plastic thing, less symmetrical, and it is my very firm belief that we have in this scheme, in this monument, created a truly mid-twentieth-century art form.

To take up the question of material, we very honestly, Mr. Walker and members of the Commission, are of two minds about the matter.

We have started with concrete and we are talking not about the raw, grey, mixed concrete, but a very sophisticated concrete, if I may use that word, which would be made of very white quartz aggregate, of white cement and white sand, of extreme density, so its finished product would be denser than marble or denser than limestone which would be hewn [illegible] to give it the maximum sparkle and to hide whatever surface imperfections resulted from the building of the monument.

The concrete would be very hard and we are assured by our engineers, Bennett Mitchell -- I talked to other structural engineers -- that we would have no cracking for specific.

Advanced concrete technology is very rapid.

The reason for having it as a great monolith is because we wanted to avoid all kinds of joints which in themselves, in marble, do stain and have to be repointed, and that kind of thing, but because it was one great piece of sculpture we wanted to keep it without joints.

I have told Judge Biddle I say very honestly, with the concrete I think we have and can produce a thoroughly dignified material.

There are buildings built today of materials such as mosaic which is that kind of material which are like the Pan-American Building in New York, and Bankers Trust, and others, and even several buildings here in Washington which are great civic monuments, and bets have been made that this material will stand up and also last and be thoroughly satisfactory.

I would say, and this is what I told Judge Biddle, that with the concrete we are at least 98-99 per cent sure.

With marble we would be 100 per cent sure, and very honestly, we in talking between ourselves have kept this subject somewhat open.

If enough money can be raised to do it in marble we may do it in marble.

This is about all I can say at this time about

This is about all I can say at this time about
we may do it in marble.

If enough money can be raised to do it in marble
this subject somewhat open.

Very honestly, we in talking between ourselves have kept
With marble we would be 100 per cent sure, and
that with the concrete we are at least 98-99 per cent sure.

I would say, and this is what I told Judge Biddle,
material will stand up and also last and be thoroughly satis-
factory.

are great civic monuments, and both have been made that this
others, and even several buildings here in Washington which
Pan-American Building in New York, and Bankers Trust, and
as mosaic which is that kind of material which are like the

I have told Judge Biddle I say very honestly, with
the concrete I think we have and can produce a thoroughly
dignified memorial.

sculpture we wanted to keep it without joints.
that kind of thing, but because it was one great piece of
naive, in marble, do what one have to be ashamed, and
because we wanted to have all kinds of color mixed in them-

The reason for having it as a great monolith is
Several concrete technology is very much.

material.

We live in a world of experts. We all depend on experts of various kinds. Our experts assure us that the concrete will be thoroughly satisfactory, but I would like to emphasize the fact that the concrete we are thinking of here is not the raw, gray, naked, pitted material that is generally associated with concrete in crude construction.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Any other question?

Thank you, Mr. Pederson.

Go ahead with anything else that you would like to say.

Had you anything further?

MR. PEDERSON: No, I will be very pleased ---

MR. BIDDLE: Give the difference in cost between the two.

MR. PEDERSON: In the absence of a full design, full preliminary designs for the project, we estimate that marble would cost a million dollars more, and granite a million and a half dollars more over the bush hammered reconstituted marble.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: One question I might ask that I do not think has been brought out anywhere: Is it the expectation that this monument would be paid for by Congress or public subscription?

material.

We live in a world of experts. We all depend on experts of various kinds. Our experts assure us that the concrete will be thoroughly satisfactory, but I would like to emphasize the fact that the concrete we are pouring of here is not the raw, ready, mixed, plated material that is generally associated with concrete in crude construction.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any other question?

Thank you, Mr. Pederson.

Go ahead with anything else that you would like to say.

Had you anything further?

MR. [illegible]: No, I will be very pleased --

MR. DINGER: Give the difference in cost between the two.

MR. PEDERSON: In the absence of a full design, full preliminary designs for the project, we estimate that marble would cost a million dollars more, and granite a million and a half dollars more over the plain hammered [illegible] marble.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: One question I might ask that I do not think has been brought out anywhere: Is it the expectation that this monument would be paid for by Congress or public subscription?

MR. BIDDLE: The situation is this -- it is the usual situation -- Mr. McCormack has assured the House in arguing for the resolution, the second resolution, that a large amount of private funds would be raised. I think a large amount will be raised.

I know I see Mr. Dunn here from the Communication Workers of America -- a large amount will be raised, I think, by the unions.

They are champing at the bit, and a large amount by the general public.

Then if we get, say, a kitty of what, $3,000,000, we go back to Congress and say, "You do the rest" -- I think they will do it.

MR. WALKER: I would like to ask one more question and that is, after these many months of having this work on exhibition, and so on, are you still satisfied with it the way it is?

MR. PEDERSON: We in totality, yes, we think that we have been asked by Mr. Biddle's commission to study the placing of a bas relief or a statue within this complex, or just outside it, close to it, which we will do when we are told to proceed with that study.

We are completely satisfied that the monument as designed is good. There are refinements which we certainly

designed is good. There are refinements which we certainly

We are completely satisfied that the monument as

told to proceed with that study.

just outside it, close to it, which we will do when we are

placing of a bas relief or a statue within this complex, or

we have been asked by Mr. Biddle's commission to study the

MR. PODSHEDOV: We in toto, yes, we think that

way it

exhibition, and so on, are you still satisfied with it the

and that is, after these many months of having this work on

MR. [illegible]: I would like to ask one more question

they will do it.

we go back to Congress and say, "You do the rest" -- I think

Then if we get, say, a fifty of what, $3,000,000,

the General Public.

They are champing at the bit, and a large amount by

think, by the nations.

I know I see Mr. Dunn here from the Commemoration

workers of America -- a large amount will be raised, I

large account will be raised.

Large account of private funds could be raised. I think a

waiting for the resolution, the second resolution, that a

mural situation -- Mr. Podshedov has assured the House in

MR. BIDDLE: The situation is this -- it is the

will incorporate as we go.

I would say that certainly will benefit by their criticism of the profession and others and I think as an architect you appreciate that this is an esquisse and not a completely ---

MR. WALKER: That was the basis of my inquiry, as to whether you thought that.

MR. BIDDLE: Don't you think you might add to Mr. Walker's question that those points at which you tentatively indicated to the Commission the other day the statue might go -- I think here is the design right here -- perhaps you could do it on that.

MR. PEDERSON: I think I almost can do it better here, if I may.

We showed the Commission the possibility of putting a seated statue of the President down here as an element in the approach from the parking lot.

I very honestly did not satisfy the Commission. They felt it should be closer to the memorial itself.

We have talked about puttinga bas relief on this small stele.

MR. WALKER: Bearing his name.

MR. PEDERSON: The one bearing his name in the monument.

will incorporate as we go.

I would say that certainly will benefit by simplification of the procession and others and I think as an architect you appreciate that this is an sculpture and not [illegible] only ---

MR. WALKER: Only was the basis of my inquiry, or to whether you thought that.

MR. RUDOLPH: Don't you think you might add to Mr. Walker's question also there points at which you [illegible] indicated to the Commission the other day the status might go -- I think here is the design right here -- perhaps you could do it on that.

MR. PEDERSON: I think I almost can do it better here, if I may.

[illegible] the Commission the possibility of putting a seated statue of the President down here as an element in the approach from the parking lot.

I very honestly did not actually the Commission. They felt it should be closer to the memorial itself.

We have talked about putting [illegible] on this small stele.

MR. WALKER: Leaving his name.

MR. PEDERSON: The one bearing his name in the [illegible].

We have talked about possibly a statue, but this is a more complicated thing because it is such a powerful center of interest, it has to be very carefully studied.

We have talked about putting a statue very close to the monument in this area or in this area as being the main approaches, and all I can say now is that it is a rather tricky design problem which we have to go into in depth.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you think that any statue would be out of scale with the enormous size of the stele in relation to the stele, the size of them? A bas relief offers a different proposition, but a statue is more difficult.

MR. PEDERSON: The bas relief here offers no problem at all.

Of course, appropriately, I think the statue of the President should be either a bas relief or seated.

I think the one in Grosvenor Square, rather heroic upright -- after all, the President was in a wheelchair entirely during his presidency, so this seems to be the spot.

But it may be out here, it may be out here. An awful lot is going to depend on what the statue itself is, what the sculptor produces, which we, as Judge Biddle says, would come back to you with as a detail.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Any more questions of Mr. Pederson?

If not, Francis, who would you like to call next?

MR. BIDDLE: May I call Mr. Belluschi next?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly. We are very glad to hear from Pietro.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think it would be kind of presumptious of me to try to sell the scheme because you have your own opinion and it would be useless to say I like it very much because I was on the jury.

I would like to add a little bit to what Judge Biddle mentioned. The first committee which was given the task to select the site and draw a program. But then there was a jury which was composed of five people, a museum director, a landscape architect, three architects including Paul Rudolph of Yale, Dean Hudnut of Harvard, emeritus, Church the landscape architect from San Francisco, and Bartlett Hays, director of the Henderson Gallery in Andover, and myself.

I would like to bring out one point. First of all, I forgot Judge Biddle said we had better tell them why you are an expert. I hate to do that, other than I have been somewhat less committed as an architect since I have been at MIT for the last eleven years. Probably they think I have

CHAIRMAN FINCH: Any more questions of Mr. [illegible]?

[illegible]

If not, Francis, who would you like to call next?

MR. [illegible]: May I call [illegible] Mahoney next?

CHAIRMAN FINCH: Certainly. We are very glad to hear from Pasco.

MR. [illegible]: I think it would be kind of presumptuous of me to try to sell the scheme because you have your own opinion and it would be needless to say I like it very much because I was on the jury.

I would like to add a little bit to what Judge Biddle mentioned. The jury certainly [illegible] given the task to select the site and draw a program. But then there was a jury which was composed of five people, a museum director, a landscape architect, three architects including Paul Rudolph of Yale, Dean Hudnut of Harvard, emeritus, Gruzen the landscape architect from San Francisco, and Bartlett Hays, director of the Henderson Gallery in Andover, and myself.

I would like to bring out one point. First of all, I forgot Judge Biddle said we had better tell them why you are an expert. I hate to do that, other than I have been connected like [illegible] in Stockbridge since I have been at MIT for the last eleven years. Probably they think I have

less to do, so I have been asked many times to judge on juries.

In fact, right now I am on one in Sacramento for the governor's mansion, and one in Boston, the City Hall competition which should be open next week, and one for the hospital here in Washington, and another one for the AIA, I think, later in the season.

But I have been on twenty or thirty competitions, so I have become an expert on competitions if nothing else.

But I would say, the point I wanted to make, which I think is very important, we all felt in the beginning when the site was selected that there was a danger that this monument at this site, if not properly, had not been a properly designed monument, would be in conflict with the three other monuments, the Jefferson, the Lincoln, and the Washington.

This should be, in a sense, a landscape solution more than a monumental solution with columns and heavy building.

I think this has solved that problem rather brilliantly because it really has to be considered, and I think that photograph shows it as part of the landscape.

The trees are an essential part of the solution.

The steles are also changing, and thin and

ideas to do, so I have been asked many times to judge on
juries.

In fact, right now I am on one in connection for
the governor's mansion, and one in Boston, the City Hall
competition which should be open next week, and one for the
hospital here in Washington, and another one for the AIA,
I think, later in the season.

But I have been on twenty or thirty competitions,
so I have become an expert on competitions if nothing else.
But I would say, the point I wanted to make, which
I think is very important, we all felt in the beginning when
the site was selected that there was a danger that this
monument at this site, if not properly, had not been a
properly designed monument, would be in conflict with the
three other monuments, the Jefferson, the Lincoln, and the
Washington.

This should be, in a sense, a landscape solution
more than a monumental solution with column and heavy
outline.

I think this has solved that problem rather grif-
fishly because it really has to be considered, and I think
that photograph shows it as part of the landscape.

The trees are an essential part of the solution.

The steles are also changing, and thin and

transparent, and you see the Potomac through the lagoon.

So there is nothing in conflict with the other one. It is a light one. If you make it too light or make some other solution, that you have to get to it to see it, then it would fail also as a monument since it is expected many more people will see it driving along than they would by going there directly.

Also, it makes the best use of this peninsula as a park. I think it is simply an indication that that study of how to reach there, and the molding of the ground around it, the hill, artificial hill created, so that you get the full visual impact from many ways and many directions, is an important element of the solution.

I would like to bring that to your attention.

The jury went through some little less than six hundred entries. There were many sculptures. The criticism was that this was really, the architects had given the prevalence, rather than visual artists, but in effect I would say thirty per cent were sculptures.

We would try to be sympathetic to the fact that sculpture would have been very appropriate. The fact that we haven't found that any had the power to stand on its own and count doesn't say anything against the status of sculpture nowadays.

I think I want to be very brief. There are just two points I want to make. One is that in my opinion, and this is a personal opinion, that this is a terribly important event because here the Federal Government has seen fit to put enough confidence, and has entrusted and has gone out and allowed people to give their expression of what a monument in the 1960's could or should be.

I must say that this is not an age of monument builders. I don't think we have to go very far to establish that. We have other things which we are more preeminent in.

So the visual arts have been, in the past, somewhat relegated to a minor role in our civilization, in our society.

But I have a feeling, and I think most of the architects will agree, that we are groping and that we are successfully groping for an expression which is our own.

I just returned from Europe. I was there last week and the week before, and there is this sense that America is the light, rightly or wrongly, with all our shortcomings, all our self-criticism, that we are doing more in the creative arts of all kinds, performing arts and visual arts, but if it is to count the number of museums, going on the number of exhibitions, the freedom which they have to express themselves, this is the turning point.

It seems to me that this is the first monument, not only that has been sponsored by the Government, but a monument which is the first one where the expression is not derivative but really creative.

Now, the fact that there is agreement is a good one. If everybody agreed it was a kind monument, I would have been rather worried, but the fact that a lot of very good people like it I think is most encouraging.

I was going to answer the question you placed.

You said: "How do you like it now?"

We more or less lived with this for the last two and a half years or three years but I liked it very much in the beginning. I like it more and more. I think it has enormous possibility.

I think when it is built future generations will appreciate it and like it very much.

That is my opinion.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Pietro.

Are there any questions you would like to ask?

Thank you very much.

MR. BIDDLE: Would you like to call Mr. Purvis now?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Gentlemen, you all know Mr. Purvis who has met with us many times.

MR. PURVIS: For the record, my name is Purvis,

Edmond R. I have been associated with the architect for a great many years. From January 1949, to January 1960, I was chief executive officer of the AIA. I retired from that position and stayed on as consultant to the Board until 1961. I have not completely retired and am back in architectural practice.

During my incumbency, Judge Biddle came to me and asked for our help in getting the competition going.

I was rather close to that whole operation.

I can assure you, I don't think there is need to do so, that this competition was conceived and organized and conducted in the highest professional way with the absolute approval of the AIA and its Board.

I do not think that I can add very much to what has already been said other than to make one or two observations.

I don't know whether you have in your files, Mr. Chairman, a resolution that was adopted by the Board of the AIA in January 1961, just abour a year ago.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We do have it, but we would be glad to have you read it.

MR. PURVIS: Resolved, That the Board of Directors commend the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission and in particular its chairman, Francis Biddle, for all its outstanding use of the competition system, calling upon

creative and artistic resources of the entire Nation in the design of the proposed monument to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The Board reaffirms its belief that public buildings and monuments of such importance require competition conducted under carefully set rules and professional and ethical standards.

This the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission has done with the assistance of the American Institute of Architects.

It has furthermore been forwarded by a most competent and expert professional advisor, Mr. Edmond Bacon, AIA, executive director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission.

Most importantly, it has appointed a distinguished jury which has performed a commendable service to American architecture and the Nation by selecting an outstanding design.

I think, sir, that is all I have to say other than that Mr. Belluschi took the liberty of going a little bit farther and advancing a personal opinion. I would like to have the same privilege and say that in my personal opinion this is a very fine monument and I sincerely hope that it will be built.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you. We are indeed glad to

creative and artistic resources of the entire Nation in the design of the proposed monument to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The Board reaffirms its belief that public buildings and monuments of such importance require competition conducted under carefully set rules and professional and ethical standards.

This the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission has done with the assistance of the American Institute of Architects.

It has furthermore been forwarded by a most competent and expert professional adviser, Mr. Gordon Bunshaft, executive Director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission.

Most importantly, it has appointed a distinguished jury which has performed a commendable service to American architecture and the Nation by selecting an outstanding design.

I think, sir, that is all I have to say other than that Mr. Reifsnyder took the liberty of going a little further and advancing a personal opinion. I would like have the same privilege and say that in my personal opinion this is a very fine document and I sincerely hope that it will be built.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you. We are indeed glad to

have your views on this.

We do have a copy of the resolution in our files.

All right, Francis, who is next?

MR. BIDDLE: There are two more, Mr. Johnson and -- I think Mr. Johnson, perhaps, now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are very glad to hear from Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Finley, I am an architect in New York. Perhaps you know the Seagram building best of any of our works that I did with Mr. Vander Rohe.

I come under three hats. I am also a disappointed competitor for this competition.

My third hat is in the storing of architectural information with the Museum of Modern Art where I did work with the history of the Twentiety Century.

In Washington, the Benedictine Abbey of St. Anselm.

Also, Dumbarton Oaks.

With that out of the way, I have to disagree with my former testifiers and friends.

I think this is a perfectly beautiful thing. I do not think it needs excuses or defenses of any kind.

To me, I might say, it is the epitome of mid-century art.

You cannot use the term "architecture" because I

get it mixed up with sculpture. It is both. I think it can be defended in many ways.

I would like, for instance, to start with the essence of a monument and in this age I have to disagree with Mr. Belluschi. I think we are in an age of great monuments. I think this is one. I think it is extraordinary in that in a democracy, in good, sensible ways of appointing a commission and having a competition under the official rules, that such a magnificent design could eventuate.

Mine was quite different. Mine didn't even win honorable mention of any kind. It was a domed building, all in marble with a great big statue inside it, just to show how conservative I did get.

But I feel that the democratic process picked this and now that I have seen this I find this superbly interesting.

A monument must, perhaps, today do two things. It has to be connected with the past. It is of the ages. It is not a trick world's fair kind of design. It has to refer back. But it also has to partake of its century.

I used only two that come to mind as examples, the greatest of all, perhaps the Washington Monument, and the new Taft Memorial. Both of them do both.

The Washington Monument is an obelisk, an old, old

old symbol reworked entirely under 19th century idea of scale, materials, of siting -- nothing Egyptian about it whatsoever.

I could say the same. I didn't want to go into it too long about the Taft Memorial which is neither classical nor modern but both -- it is perfectly obvious that the two great recollections of history, of tablet and stele -- everyone recognizes them at once, every passing tourist will recognize the symbolism without having to name it.

What is of today?

What is of today is in essence the material -- I must disagree with the architect himself -- this must be built of concrete.

I know what we think of concrete normally in our profession. What they think of is Creagh's buildings falling apart in Marseilles.

You have heard today, even if it were or should be built in concrete at this scale and of this clay shade,these are clay steles -- these are done with knives -- this is not a stone conception and should not be carried out in stone. It is of the essence that you cannot build it even if you covered it in marble, except concrete.

That is of our day, of our day much more important than that point of material, being the arrangement of space.

scale, materials, of sitting -- nothing Egyptian about it whatsoever.

I could say the same. I didn't want to go into it too long about the Tarl Memorial which is neither classical nor modern but both -- it is perfectly obvious that the two great recollections of history, of tablet and scale -- everyone recognizes them at once, every passing Tartar will recognize the symbolism without having to name it.

What is of today?

What is of today is in essence the material -- I must disagree with the architect himself -- this must be built of concrete.

I know what we think of concrete normally in our profession. What they think of in Europe's Mediterranean climate apart in Marseilles.

You have heard today, even if it were or should be built in concrete at this scale and of this clay shape, these are clay scales -- these are done with knives -- this is not a stone conception and should not be carried out in stone. It is of the essence that you cannot build it even if you covered it in marble, simply nonsense.

What is of our day, of our day much more important than what point of history, under the rearrangement of space

It is an interior room, like all great architectures, an interior space, the interior of today surrounded by planes that move as you move.

As far as I know, this has never been done before. Like all great architects, it is an interior room.

This brings me to my final warning point.

Everyone -- I know myself so I can say it for my architectural friends -- how hard it is to judge a building, in spite of the architects and what Judge Biddle may think of that movie. It was terrible. What I think of the model is still worse. You have to use size of imagination. You have to take a step-by-step processional. Can you imagine passing in a competition on Chartres Cathedral, from the model or from a camera shot?

You have to let the shape flow. The sky is the clouds in this room. The windows are the views as they change out into the parks, of the Potomac. You have to imagine those trees. There is no way to photograph them.

I merely want to repeat what I said when I came in, that at last we might want to view this as the most successful monument of the mid-century, of my country, that we have today.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you. Any questions you would like to ask?

It is an interior room, like all great architectures, an interior space, the interior of tomorrow surrounded by planes that move as you move.

As far as I know, things never been done before. Like all great architects, it is an interior room.

This brings me to my final warning point.

Everyone -- I know myself so I can say it for my architectural friends -- how hard it is to judge a building, in spite of the architects and what Judge Hoehl may think of that maybe. It was terrible. When I think of the model is still worse. You have to use size of imagination. You have to take a step-by-step processional. Can you imagine passing in a competition on Cherries Cathedral, from the model or from a camera shot?

You have to let the shape flow. The sky is the church in this room. The windows are the views as they change out into the parks, of the Potomac. You have to imagine those trees. There is no way to photograph them.

I merely want to repeat what I said when I came in, that at last we might want to view this as the most successful monument of the mid-century, of my country, that we have today.

CHAIRMAN HOEHL: Thank you. Any questions you would like to have?

MR. BIDDLE: I want to say one very brief thing in connection with that. This was the only competition I ever heard of where the architects were told what to do. They said, there is a space, build something on it. I think it gave them the kind of freedom that Mr. Johnson said -- this is both culture and architecture. I think that may be the result of that.

Mr. Haskell.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to call Mr. Haskell?

MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Glad to hear from you.

MR. HASKELL: For identification, I am editor of Architectural Forum, one of the three large publications that serve the profession. In our case, we serve those parts of the public that are interested in architecture.

I am also adjunct professor at Columbia School of Architecture, and the Encyclopedia Britannica thinks I am qualified to write for its book of the year on events around the world each year.

I am not an architect and have had no hopes of any kind, no design of my own for this, no hopes of succeeding as a competitor.

I would like very much to address myself very simply to what I think are the admirable questions that were

MR. BIDDLE: I want to say one very brief thing in connection with that. This was the only competition I ever heard of where the architects were told what to do. They said, there is a space, build something on it. I think it gave them the kind of freedom they do. Because well -- this is both culture and architecture. I think that may be the result of that.

Mr. Mumford.

CHAIRMAN PINCHOT: Would you like to call Mr. Buckley?

MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PINCHOT: Glad to have you.

MR. BUCKLEY: For identification, I am editor of Architectural Forum, one of the three large publications that serve the profession. In our case, we serve those parts of the public that are interested in architecture.

I am also adjunct professor at Columbia School of Architecture, and the Encyclopedia Britannica thinks I am qualified to write for the book of the year on events around the world each year.

I am not an architect and have had no hopes of any kind, no design of my own for this, no hopes of succeeding as a competitor.

I would like very much to address myself very simply to what I take to be somewhat different

asked by Ralph Walker.

After reminding you again that this has been a very professionally conducted enterprise that has had the benefit not only of these excellent men who served on the jury but also the best thought of some five hundred of the most energetic, many of them the younger spirits in our country that our compatriots were able to muster.

This is a revolutionary effort.

I think incalculable harm could be done possibly by upsetting this kind of a procedure and the harm could last for a long time. That is just a personal hint.

Now, the first question that Mr. Walker asked was how this monument might enhance the reputation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Despite the bashfulness of the architect in not proclaiming what he did, I think it is in this regard that his success is extraordinary.

This monument goes with the man in a most extraordinary way. Think of it in comparison with the Lincoln Memorial which has been criticized again and again as not showing Lincoln the logsplitter. But it does show the Lincoln of the, the perfectly lapidary statement of his Gettysburg Address.

This tight, compact, rounded statement of the

asked by Peter Walker.

After reminding you again that this has been a very professionally conducted enterprise that has had the benefit not only of those excellent men who served on the jury but also the vast knowledge of the Civil Trial Section of the most knowledgeable, many of them the younger sprites in our country that our competitors were able to muster.

This is a revolutionary effort.

I think Unspeakable Harm could be done possibly by upsetting this kind of a precedent and the work could last for a long time. That is just a personal hint.

Now, the first question that Mr. Walker asked was how this monument might enhance the reputation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Despite the backfulness of the architect in not proclaiming what he did, I think it is in this regard that his success is extraordinary.

This monument can't be seen in a mere ordinary way. Think of it in comparison with the Lincoln Memorial which has been criticized again and again as not showing Lincoln the logalitter. But it does show the Lincoln of the, the perfectly legible statement of his Gettysburg Address.

This tight, compact, rounded statement of the

Gettysburg address is mirrored in the Lincoln Memorial.

Now, what have we here? We have here a man whose approach to problems was most extraordinary. It sometimes seemed as if it would never jell. He got pieces here, there, put them together in a manner that seemed at random and lo and behold the results were lasting.

Now, what do we see here? This in architecture is these pieces brought together in a manner which strikes us first as tentative and then, as you live with it longer, comes in on you.

I have had the same experience to which there has been testimony before this, that at first I even had some shock out of this proposal. The longer I looked at it the better I liked it.

Now, also, as we all know, Roosevelt was a man who was greatly enamoured of nature, lived in nature, was in close contact with nature. This is supremely a monument which fits into nature, lives with nature, uses nature.

These arcades are not like the arcades that we have become so accustomed to that we walk through them without seeing them any longer.

These are vistas into nature. The sky is the roof. The vistas keep changing; the shadows keep changing the monument. The height of the sun keeps changing the monument.

Delegates ordered to attend in the Lincoln Memorial.

Now, what have we here? We have here a man whose approach to problems was most extraordinary. It seemed as it it would never fail. He got pieces here, there, put them together in a manner that seemed at random and lo and behold the results were amazing.

Now, what do we do next? This is accomplished in three pieces brought together in a manner which strikes us first as tentative and then, as you live with it longer, comes in on you.

I have had the same experience to which there has been familiarity before him. That is first I wave and scoff shook out of this proposal. The longer I looked at it the better I liked it.

Now, also, as we all know, Roosevelt was a man who was greatly enamored of nature, lived in nature, was in close contact with nature. This is supremely a monument with Fitz John Porter, Lieut Gen Scott, USA Century.

These arcades are not like the arcades that we have become so accustomed to that we walk through them without seeing them any longer.

These are virtues into nature. The sky is the roof. The vistas keep changing; the shadows keep changing the monument. The color of the sun makes changing the monument.

This is an extraordinary combination.

When the sun converges from two different directions like this it is quite phenomenal that at one and the same time you have this new expression of nature and you have the expression of Roosevelt's mind.

Now, on this site in relation to other monuments, I really think that there is something very fine here in the fact that the distance is great enough so that the distance from the other monuments is tolerable, can be taken, because it does not compose into a tight, close view where the question of a direct, formal correspondence would arise.

On the other hand, I think the contrast is highly welcome.

On this site, too, I just spoke of nature, this particular monument is peculiarly well adapted to be seen from the river, from different parts of the city, and to be beautiful from them all.

Why concrete?

I think that Mr. Johnson has covered that fairly completely.

I think that the counter-question could be asked: Why not concrete?

Concrete is the material of which this people builds nine-tenths of what it builds in the way of lasting

bridge nine-tenths of what it builds in the way of lasting

Concrete is the material of union this people

Why not concrete?

I think that the counter-question could be asked:

I think that Mr. Johnson has covered that fairly completely.

Why concrete?

beautiful from them all.

from the river, from different parts of the city, and to be

particular monument is peculiarly well adapted to be seen

On this site, too, I just spoke of nature, this

welcome.

On the other hand, I think the counsel is right

the question of a street, formal correspondence would arise,

because it does not compose into a sight, close view where

distance from the other monuments it ideally, can be taken,

fact that the distance is greater enough so that the

I really think that there is something very fine here in the

Now, on this site in relation to other monuments,

have the expression of honorable mind.

same time you have this new expression of nature and you

tions like this it is quite phenomenal that at one and the

When two such converge like two different direc-

This is an extraordinary combination.

buildings.

Concrete is the material on which technology is now struggling for perfection.

Concrete needs not be rough and primitive. It can be, however. Sometimes that is an advantage.

Art must never be confused with polishing, and in this instance I see if this is successful, the kind of finish on concrete that you have all seen, sparkling, marble, scintillating marble aggregate finish on this.

I do not in this instance happen to see the rough form marks that have characterized some concrete. This is not one of those deviations back into primitivism in order to get a fresh start in architecture.

Now, why contemporary?

Again, why and why not?

I think the best phrase that has been coined to declare the proper relationship of art is that art lives in and produces the eternal present.

It is the eternal present. It consequently reaches far back, as far back as stonehenge and reaches forward as far as it can.

It puts all that into the present moment.

There is a tremendous problem for architects, especially among the artists, in how to handle the past in

buildings.

Concrete is the material on which technology is now struggling for perfection.

Concrete needs not be rough and primitive. It can be, however. Sometimes that is an advantage.

Art must never be confused with polishing, and in this instance I see if this is successful, the kind of finish on concrete that you have all seen, sparkling, marble, entertaining merely expensive finish on this.

I do not in this instance happen to see the rough form marks that have characterized some concrete. This is not one of those deviations back into primitivism in order to get a fresh start in architecture.

Now, why contemporary?

Again, why and why not?

I think the best phrase that has been coined to declare the proper relationship of art is that art lives in and produces the eternal present.

It is the eternal present. It consequently reaches far back, as far back as otherwise and reaches forward as far as it can.

It puts all past into the present moment.

Where is a tremendous problem for structural engineering among the artists, in how to handle the past in

that relationship because those who reproduce the past in such a way that the impact upon the beholder is that first of all he is seeing a piece of the past, has failed.

The beholder must see that he is of the past as a part of his present life and experience.

It has to be converted into the eternal present.

I think that even the epithet that was coined here concerning this proposal -- you recall it was called "instant stonehenge" -- is curiously a compliment. We would not want the stonehenge that was struggled upon by whoever they might have been, the early builders.

We get from this an illusion to stonehenge. Instant puts the present moment into it and unwittingly the detractor gave it a compliment.

This, as Mr. Johnson said better than I can say it, this reproduction of the most ancient elements, the stele and so forth -- nevertheless, the shaping that has been given to it would have been beyond the power and the capacity of those early builders.

It is expressive of the material that we are talking about. It is expressive again of the labile mind of the subject who is here celebrated.

Now, I think with Mr. Johnson that this is an extraordinarily successful thing.

Now, I think with Mr. Johnson that this is an extraordinarily economical study.

It has to be converted into the eternal present.

concerning this proposal -- you recall it was called "instant stonehenge" -- is curiously a compliment. We would not want the stonehenge that was struggled upon by whoever they might have been, the early builders.

We get from this an illusion to stonehenge.

deTraeton gave it a compliment.

This, as Mr. Johnson said better than I can say it, this reproduction of the most ancient elements, the stele and so forth -- nevertheless, the shaping that has been given to it would have been beyond the power and the capacity of those early builders.

ing about. It is expressive again of the labile mind of the subject who is here celebrated.

such a way that the impact upon the beholder is that first of all he is seeing a piece of the past, has failed.

The beholder must see that he is of the past as a part of his present life and experience.

I want to warn everybody present about one aspect of it: These men struggled with this concept for a long, long time and somehow or another arrived at a result which, seen by a jury unprepared for it, struck them, from among some five hundred submissions it struck them.

This is not an easy thing to accomplish. Some four hundred did not do so well in doing this.

One could destroy it. One could destroy it so that after all the improvements suggested by this one or that one, and add it onto it, would destroy the magic, because in any successful architectural enterprise there is, whether we like it or not, whether we like it or not, an element of magic.

Things click. This cannot be bought. It cannot be earned with sweat. It partakes of inspiration. It partakes of happy accident, and it is easy to destroy.

I hope that this thing will not be tampered with so much that we will all at once have something which, if it were submitted in a changed form, would not make that instant appeal and stand up under that prolonged and dispassionate study.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Haskell.

The usual statement we all make about works of art is that they should not be tampered with by other men.

MR. HASKELL: If permitted another minute, I should like to make another suggestion here, too, because we talk about a democracy.

In Washington, speaking of tradition, the general trend in the tradition of Washington buildings since the time of the Smithsonian, after the Smithsonian, has been fairly unilateral. It has been quite consistently conducted by those who were impressed most by the Greco-Roman tradition, from the Mediterranean.

In most of what was built, the adherence to this was extraordinarily faithful.

We have had some wonderful results out of that.

I submit, nevertheless, that during that whole period there has been among architects a very large proportion which has felt that it was not representative. It has felt indeed that it has been excluded. Many of these people are not comfortable even with those classical achievements which make me personally, for instance, very happy, but they have felt that it was impossible in Washington, in art, to get a hearing for anything else.

I would like to suggest that this submission with its strong historical overtone, its long reach back into tradition, and the fact that it makes many people happy, should be admitted even though those who in having acted in

MR. HAMLIN: If permitted another minute, I should like to make another suggestion, too, because we only speak a democracy.

In Washington, speaking of tradition, the general trend in the traditions of Washington buildings since the time of the Smithsonian, after the Smithsonian, has been fairly unilateral. It has been quite consistently conducted by those who were influenced most by the Greco-Roman tradition, from the Mediterranean.

In most of what was built, the adherence to this was extraordinarily faithful.

We have had some wonderful results out of that.

I submit, nevertheless, that during that whole period there has been among architects a very large proportion which has felt that it was not representative. It has felt indeed that it has been excluded. Many of these people are not comfortable even with those classical achievements which make me personally, for instance, very happy, but they have felt that it was impossible in Washington, in art, to get a hearing for anything else.

I would like to suggest that this submission with its strong historical overtone, its long reach back into tradition, and the fact that it makes many people happy, should be admitted even though those who in having acted in

the past from tradition might consider it was a little bit out from their standpoint.

MR. WALKER: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I would like to go back to this concrete for a moment as a material.

Masses of this size cannot be poured without some pour bond. Therefore, the treatment of the surface must be an applied treatment in many ways; otherwise, you will always have the difference.

Unfortunately, cement in its quality does not maintain itself.

I was very much impressed -- I don't know whether you saw it -- with the Coventry Cathedral.

MR. HASKELL: I didn't see it.

MR. WALKER: This is one of the most beautiful jobs of concrete I have ever seen, but it is all precast, all prestressed, all put together in sections, where the pour marks do not show. Eighty-foot columns, cast at one time.

Have you seen it, by the way?

MR. BIDDLE: Only photographs.

MR. WALKER: It is magnificent, the finest concrete structure I have ever seen.

I am just wondering whether this surface treatment

is going to be as successful.

MR. BIDDLE: Could that be applied to this?

MR. WALKER: No, these are too huge. I don't believe you can pre-cast these, pre-stress them. Maybe you can. I would like to hear an opinion.

MR. HASKELL: On that kind of thing, I am not the best witness you can have. I can simply express some faith on that side that is this:

The technology of concrete has been proceeding with such astonishing speed -- I had the great privilege in this city the other night of seeing drawings by a man who had examined one of the great monuments of human life, Hia Sofia, those wonderful drawings, the wonderful study by the devoted man who starved for it, climbed all over this like a mountain goat.

The thing that impressed him most, I think, as we spoke together, was how suddenly this happened. There were no antecedents. For eight hundred years there were no offspring. And in this world those things happen suddenly like that, and I think that is what is happening with concrete. Everybody must think differently about concrete than he did.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Did you have someone else?

MR. BIDDLE: Mr. Rowe, a member of the commission,

and a former administrative assistant of President Roosevelt who knew him well just came in and might like to say a word or two.

MR. ROWE: I don't have anything to add, Mr. Chairman.

I will make it very quick.

I think the thing that impresses me is the commission of twelve was, with one exception, unanimous in support of the memorial. I think that is damn good for a bunch of politicians.

The other comment I make is, if I were not already concerned, Mr. Johnson and the other witnesses would have convinced me quickly this morning.

I hope it will have somewhat the same effect on you.

MR. BIDDLE: Tantalizingly brief.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Francis, are there any others you want to call?

I wonder if there is anything more.

Perhaps this has been covered fully enough, but in the joint resolution of Congress providing for the competition, they made this provision, the competition for the proposed memorial should be carried out so as to insure that it will be harmonious as to the location, design, and land use of the

MR. RIDDLE: Mr. Howe, a member of the commission,

and a former administrative assistant of President Roosevelt who knew him well just came in and might like to say a word or two.

MR. ROWE: I don't have anything to add, Mr. Chairman.

I will make it very quick.

I think the thing that impresses me is the commission of twelve was, with one exception, unanimous in support of the memorial. I think that is damn good for a bunch of politicians.

The other comment I make is, if I were not already concerned, Mr. Johnson and the other witnesses would have convinced me quickly this morning.

I hope it will have somewhat the same effect on you.

MR. BIDDLE: Tantalizingly brief.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Francis, are there any others you want to call?

I wonder if there is anything more.

Perhaps this has been covered fully enough, but in the joint resolution of Congress providing for the competition, they made this provision, the competition for the proposed memorial should be carried out so as to insure that it will be harmonious as to the location, design, and land use of the

Washington Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Lincoln.

Is there anything more you want to say about that? It has been covered by several people.

MR. BIDDLE: That was expressed in the prospectus and program, not only the words used taken from the resolution, but the program stressed the necessity of building something that was harmonious, a definite condition.

I have nothing more; thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Several people want to be heard, in addition to those that we heard already.

Mr. Harbeson, John Harbeson, president of the National Academy of Design.

MR. HARBESON: Mr. Pederson, the architect, has something he would like to say.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Come ahead, Mr. Pederson.

MR. PEDERSON: I simply want to say, to add to my previous testimony, we are completely satisfied with the memorial as we designed it.

This was in the framework of any comment in answer to Mr. Walker's question. Without question, we want to do it in concrete. We always have. We think it is right.

We think we can have a successful solution. We would only go to marble if it were forced upon us and, as Mr. Johnson said, if it were sheathed in marble, you would have

memorial as we designed it.

This was in the framework of any comment in answer to Mr. Watkins question. Without question, we want to do it in accurate. We simply here. We think it is right.

We think we can have a successful solution. We would only be so happy if it were loaded upon us and, as Johnson said, if it were accepted in marble, Ian would have

to build first in concrete anyway.

The technology is concrete; the design is monolithic; it should be done in concrete.

That is all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Pederson.

Mr. Harbeson is president, as you know, of the National Academy of Design.

MR. HARBESON: First, may I say, though, that I am speaking only as a representative of the Council of the National Academy because you have members here of the National Academy of Design who have already spoken in a somewhat different vein from what I shall say, so I am speaking for the Council.

It also is my opinion that this competition, as Judge Biddle has said, was to choose an architect rather than a design. So, in criticizing the design, I am not criticizing the persons, but only the design.

In our opinion this design is not worthy to express the President who led this country in a great war, a war of even longer duration than the Civil War.

To be such a leader in difficult times he had to understand the value of order, of organization.

In our opinion there is no order in this design; it is a disorganized agglomeration of ugly forms, slabs of

In our opinion this design is not worthy to express
the President who led this country in a great war, a war of
even longer duration than the Civil War.

To be such a leader in difficult times he had to
understand the value of order, of organization.

It is a disorganized agglomeration of ugly forms, alobs of

different sizes and shapes, not a symbol of greatness.

Franklin Roosevelt was elected President of this country for four terms. No other President previously had been; no president can be under present law.

There is no symbolism of that.

He advocated the four freedoms.

There again is the figure four; there is no symbol of that sort. In fact, there is no symbolism that we can find in this project as planned on this site.

The site, by the way, is magnificent and certainly a proper one for the memorial.

Franklin Roosevelt had a great interest in the common man. There is no symbolism of that in this idea except as you see it in words put at too great length to be read easily and placed in different relation to the sun so that some will be against the light and some will be in shadow and at all different heights.

There is nothing here to grip the interest of the beholder.

We feel there is no organic relation between this design and what was mentioned in the program as the three great memorials to which it must be related.

Nor is the material proposed fitting to its use. I am not speaking of the surface form. The surface can be made

I am not speaking of the surface form. This surface can be made
of any material proposed fitting to its use.

Nor is the material proposed fitting to its use.
great memorials to which it must be related.

design and what was mentioned in the program as the three
We feel there is no organic relation between this

boulder.

There is nothing here to grip the interest of the

and at all different heights.
some will be against the light and some will be in shadow
easily and placed in different relation to the sun so that
except as you see it in works put at too great lengths to be read
common men. There is no symbolism of that in this idea
a prober one for the memorial.
Franklin deserved and a great interest in the
find in this project be planned on this site.
of this work. In fact, there is no objection that we can
There again in the figure four index is no symbol
Be advocated the four freedoms.
There is an overlying of fact.
need no president can be under present law.
county for four terms. On other Presidents previously had
different since 1941 change, but a repeal of precedent
Franklin Roosevelt was elected President of the

perfectly beautiful.

I am not speaking of the fact that concrete is considered a brutal material. I think it could be made to look well, except no building yet achieved in this climate exists as long as fifteen years without cracks. No monument is notable full of cracks.

There have been advances in the science of concrete but concrete is made of inert materials and of steel and they react differently under the influence of changes of temperature.

We have great differences here in Washington of temperature.

The expansion and contraction of steel is vastly different from that of the other materials. The marble aggregate is a cementitious material. There is ultimately cracking.

There have been attempts lately to pre-stress the reinforcement.

We have in Philadelphia a reinforced, pre-stressed structure, not existing ten years, and they already have cracks.

We have yet to find a building in this climate that does not show cracks.

President Roosevelt's memorial to the country in

the Nation's Capital deserves something better than this design.

I had thought of saying something of Mr. Roosevelt's own, just as an individual, his own interest in architecture. He, as you know, was quite interested in architecture and had many contacts with it. I know of three in particular.

Judge Biddle has already said we must not consider his wishes, but the wishes of those who are left behind. That is a point of view.

Franklin Roosevelt was, as you know, much interested in the Warm Springs Foundation. Henry Tombs was the architect. The President took such an interest on one of the prospectus showing the design, they put the name, his name, with his approval, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Architect.

When the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda was designed by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the President himself designed the tower.

That design came before this Commission. The Fine Arts Commission said it would be wise to get an architect. Paul Creagh was brought in, worked with the President, and the design was formed which this Commission approved.

Paul Creagh having become known to him, Franklin Delano Roosevelt called him in and said, "I would like you to

Delano Roosevelt called him in and said, "I would like you to

design a memorial to peace, chose a site which was to be on the square in front of the Interior Building, this building here, between it and Constitution Avenue.

There is a building there now and there was such a monument to peace designed.

Everyone in the White House at the time said it was a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

None of those three memorials had anything the character of what we see here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Harbeson.

Any questions?

MR. WALKER: No questions.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Paul Jennewein, President of the National Sculpture Society.

We are very glad to hear from you, Mr. Jennewein.

MR. JENNEWEIN: Mr. Chairman, I am Paul Jennewein of the National Sculpture Society, president, a practicing sculptor for fifty years or so.

I am on this spot. I must say in substance I agree with Mr. Harbeson and a special request I had from our Council, the National Sculptors Society, who unanimously agreed that this was a form of expression of a memorial that no one could agree with.

I mean, the speakers I hear, I feel is very much

education to me, personally.

I can see their point, but when you speak of something that belongs in my profession and have the remarks that were made with the use of sculptors, I must say that we need the expert to speak about sculpture.

This thing, I am speaking my own opinion, as form is not sculpture. It is abstract. It is a form of steles which, granted there are some very fine pieces of concrete structures built, in fact I saw one in Stuttgart -- they have this broadcasting tower, and I think it is one of the most beautiful performances in concrete that I ever saw.

Or Nervie in Italy.

But in building these things, you will have joints and no one has ever been able to overcome discoloring, or the temperatures, anything that is of concrete mixture that will be a permanent, decent job.

You know how bad it is in ordinary stone. You get variations of stone set together and there are all patterns going up, something like the UN Building, the plain facade of marble.

If that isn't the type of thing -- if that is the type of thing you desire, that is one thing. But in concrete, man-made material, I have been told by people who have worked in the stuff thirty or forty years ago, they said it will

never be possible that you can get a decent looking surface to a piece of concrete.

You know all the bricks, they are all joints, the cracks, spallings, I am talking about something that I shouldn't -- and the work that I have done has terribly suffered under the material that things were made in.

So, in substance, that is what I would like to say.

If there are any questions, I would like to answer them.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there any questions?

MR. WALKER: No.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Jennewein.

Admiral Phillips, Chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, which represents many organizations, persons in Washington.

ADMIRAL PHILLIPS: My name is Neill Phillips. I am a resident of Washington. I am chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City.

My committee is concerned, of course, not only with this monument but with the great Nation's Capital as a whole.

We have followed the monument with great interest. We have had members of our committee who are technically qualified as sculptors, architects, landscape architects, to make a thorough study, and I will put in the record our

proceedings.

I will not take up the whole time.

I will summarize them.

Then, if I wish to be questioned, I will make this very briefly.

The Committee of One Hundred voted to support its subcommittee in opposing this memorial and the reason we opposed it, interesting as this hearing has been this morning, has not been answered to my satisfaction.

Now, we oppose it not for its aesthetic or architectural values which we think are first rate; we think they are first rate, interesting, timely, and everything else. We oppose it for other reasons. One, it is at the wrong time.

We have agreed with Secretary Udall who introduced legislation when he was in Congress that fifty years should elapse after a man's death before he is memorialized by a monument in Washington.

We think that the present accelerated enthusiasm of rushing into monumental structures immediately or shortly after a man's death is very, very inadvisable.

At 16-17 years lapsing since the man's death, there has not been time to evaluate his place in history, so we think it is the wrong time.

We think it is the wrong place, because one of the

great things about Washington is its open spaces, its parks, its grass and trees. They are under terrific competition now.

So many people who see a park or an open space immediately visualize it as a place to put down a highway or a monument.

This is an absolute showcase down here.

If this monument is allowed or erected there, then there are architects and memorial associations all over the country with a perfectly legitimate reason to go to Congress and say, "We want this area, we want that area; we want this area, we want that area."

There can be no end in the democratic form of government of stopping them.

Just in that connection, I would like to point out that there are now proposals to put up monuments to Presidents Madison and Wilson, General John J. Pershing, the Boy Scouts of America, the Third Infantry Division Association, the 42nd Rainbow Association, Haym Solomon of Philadelphia, who provided the money to pay for George Washington in the days of the Continental Congress, Grover Cleveland, the American Mothers, the Colored Soldiers and Sailors, Ernie Pyle, Brigadier General William Mitchell, Mrs. Mary LcLeod Bethune, Taras Krevchenko, a Ukranian Poet, a champion of liberty, who died in 1861 -- those are just some of the seeds that have

been planted. It will flow.

Our Committee of One Hundred thinks that this beautiful Potomac Park should be left alone and that the competition between the Washington and Lincoln Memorials or the Jefferson should not be gone into as we feel that this structure, fine as it is, would provide.

We finally think that this monument, if it is decided not to wait until fifty years after a man's death, it should be put someplace else, off on a big hillside, someplace like that. We think it would be perfectly magnificent.

The final action, we have written the Honorable Alan Bible as of January 9, 1962, Senate Office Building:

Dear Senator Bible:

The Committee of 100 supports the proposed legislation, S. 2501 and H. R. 7664, those introduced by Senator Paul Douglas and Congressman Harris B. McDowell supports the proposed legislation to establish the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial National Park in West Potomac Park.

We feel it is essential to preserve this park area as a setting for existing monuments and believe that Franklin Roosevelt would most wish to be remembered by a restful park and garden which could be used by the people he served rather than by another monumental

structure competing for attention in the Washington skyline.

We enthusiastically favor the purpose of the pending bill introduced by Senator Douglas and urge your committee to report favorably on it.

That is all I have, sir.

I will put this in the record, if you wish.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there any questions anyone wishes to ask Admiral Phillips?

Thank you very much, indeed, for coming.

Are there other persons in the room who would like to be heard?

MR. Jett, is there anything you would like to say?

MR. JETT: I have no statement to make.

That has been presented officially to the Department.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You have nothing you want to say at the moment?

MR. JETT: Nothing at the moment.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mrs. Rowe tells me she does not wish to say anything at the moment.

Did you have anything?

MR. LOUCHHEIM: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. William E. Finley, Director

of the National Planning Commission -- I think he went out.

Is there anyone else now that would like to be heard? We would be delighted to hear you.

MR. Biddle, would you like to conclude? I believe everyone in the room has spoken that wishes to speak.

MR. BIDDLE: I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there anything more you would like to add?

MR. BIDDLE: You have been so courteous about giving us all the time we wanted, I feel all bottled up now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Not at all; it is a very important matter and we are delighted to devote the morning to it.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt? It seems possible that one of the group has not been heard from.

We have, I think, all the members of the Commission, yours included, I believe, a message from one of the Labor Unions.

Would it not be interesting to hear from him?

MR. BIDDLE: I already asked Mr. Dunn if he wants to. I hope he will.

MR. PERRY: I am putting my oar in hoping that he may be persuaded to do so.

MR. DUNN: Mr. Chairman, I am so humbled by being asked to speak before such an august body that you all are

of the Business Planning Committee -- I think he went out.

Is there anyone else who this would like to be heard? He would be delighted to hear you.

MR. GIBBLE, would you like to comment? I believe everyone in the room has spoken that wishes to speak.

MR. GIBBLE: I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN PICKLES: Is there anything only Pat would like to say?

MR. BLOCK: You have been so courteous about giving us all the time we wanted, I feel all bottled up now.

CHAIRMAN PICKLES: Not at all; it is a very important matter and we are delighted to devote the morning to it.

MR. PENDY: Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt? It seems possible that one of the group that was heard from, We have, I understand, all the members of the Commission, young included, I believe, a message from one of the Labor Unions.

Would it not be interesting to hear from him?

MR. BIDDLE: I already asked Mr. Dunn if he wanted to. I hope he will.

MR. PENDY: I was talking my way in hoping mine be may be persuaded to do so.

MR. DUNN: Mr. Chairman, I am so humbled by being asked to speak before such an august body that you all are

witnessing for one time a labor leader who is speechless.

However, our organization is a part of the labor movement, is one hundred per cent behind the building of a memorial.

We initiated action at our own convention that one be built.

We thoroughly disagree with the fine gentleman who would rather wait fifty years, but I don't know why it would be ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, a hundred.

That is not the important thing, I think.

We particularly in labor benefited greatly by the acts of this great man. We who prospered through his greatness, the contributions he made, would like to participate in building a memorial.

We did not take the position until a recent letter you got on the design. However, we are perfectly willing to ride with the experts in this field.

A new expression I heard this morning is, a breakthrough into modern architecture and art.

Our organization wants to get behind the financing and building of the memorial at the quickest moment.

I do have one comment to make which I think is very personal, but also I think it drives home the point I am trying to make that we of the generation that benefited should

participate in the building.

I was very shocked to have my own daughter in reading The Making of a President, 1960, ask me -- she is 26 years old -- "Daddy, I have heard you speak a lot since the time I was a little girl about what a great man Franklin Roosevelt was. I didn't get much except at home. There wasn't much in the history books about him," she said.

I wonder how many other children likewise do not really appreciate how grat a man he was because we did not have to suffer in the depression and go through the things that your generation did.

So I think it is up to us from that, those of us who benefited from this great man's life, to put forward the effort now to do something and not depend upon a future generation who didn't know him as we did to do so.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have a letter here from your committee. We will put it in the record.

I might say that we have several other letters. One is from Major Clark, Gilmore Clark, former Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; another one from Lorrimer Rich, architect, and a number of individuals who I won't take time to read, but they will be a part of the record here.

Is there anything else that anyone would like to

committee. We will put it in the record.

I might say that we have several other letters,
one is from Major Clark, Gilmore Clark, former Chairman of
the Commission of Fine Arts; another one from Dorothea Dix,
architect, and a number of individuals who I won't take time
to read, but they will be a part of the record here.

say?

MR. WALKER: I think, Mr. Chairman, we have heard a very eloquent presentation for, and an equally eloquent presentation against.

I think this thing is serious enough for us to give deep and further consideration to it, and with all due respect to the speechless labor leader who did a very good job, I think that there is no sense of immediacy or urgency in this thing and I would like very much, if at our next meeting of this Commission, we could have the architect present with us and discuss the thing a little more fully from his point of view, and also from the standpoint of, even though I agree with Douglas Haskell, that things can be spoiled by whittling down, whether some further suggestions might be brought out that would help make this monument better, because I think we owe it to the competition and to the commission to take this thing seriously enough to find out whether we could give approval to it after further consideration on our part.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly there is no question the Commission of Fine Arts takes this very seriously indeed because a great deal of effort and time have gone into the preparation of this design and if Mr. Biddle and Mr. Pederson would like to do that, you might not, Mr. Pederson ---

MR. WALKER: We are of this opinion, Mr. Biddle,

that we can be much more critical of things, we don't have the press or the public here present and being fellow practitioners, professionals, it is, I think, a much better way.

Through the long history of the Commission a certain amount of informality has taken place where two of the Commission or more have talked with the architect informally to see whether we could ---

MR. BIDDLE: May I suggest, then, that the possibility, because we are anxious to get it moving, of Mr. Pederson's staying on today as long as you want and talking to him in the afternoon in private?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would that be more convenient to Mr. Pederson to come back again?

MR. BIDDLE: Would it?

MR. WALKER: I was wondering whether we can't have a meeting on this because we ought to have time to digest this a little bit.

MR. PEDERSON: I am at your service either today or any other day that you may want me here, given sufficient notice.

MR. BIDDLE: I don't want to press anything. I will do whatever the Commission wants. It seems to be very normal.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Let me ask you a question:

How would that fit in with your schedule? This is

going, I suppose, to the Planning Commission soon?

MR. BIDDLE: Not necessarily, now that the site has been decided. You once pointed out they have jurisdiction, but the resolution provides that we take their advice.

When is the Planning Commission's next meeting, may I ask that?

MRS. ROWE: February 1.

MR. BIDDLE: February 1.

MRS. ROWE: The following month.

MR. BIDDLE: Doesn't interfere with anything at all.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What about Congress?

MR. BIDDLE: As soon as you gentlemen get through with us, we will go to Congress. There is no limitation there. I will do whatever is necessary.

I would like to get it decided today, but if you still feel, if the members feel that they would prefer to have more time, of course I have not the slightest objection to it. Perhaps you would like to talk it over by yourselves.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We would have an executive session and talk it over, of course.

MR. BIDDLE: I mean about the possibility of Mr. Pederson's staying any more today.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would any of you like Mr. Pederson to stay on and talk to us?

there. I will do whatever is necessary.

I would like to get it decided today, but if you
will feel, if the members feel that they would prefer to
have more time, of course I have not the slightest objection
to it. Perhaps you would like to talk it over, if you
and talk it over, of course.

MR. BISHOP: I mean about the possibility of Mr.
Delarova's staying any more weeks.

CHAIRMAN MORLEY: Would you like Mr. Pearson to stay on and talk to us?

MR. ORR: We would like to digest this.

MR. RAPUANO: I think we should go into executive session first and then call on Mr. Pederson after we have had a chance to digest this ourselves.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: At another day?

MR. RAPUANO: Possibly another day.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right.

I think we do adjourn at this moment and we will talk it over ourselves.

MR. BIDDLE: We will stay around a little bit because you might wish more this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think we would ask you to do that because I think you have covered it very fully and very well.

Thank you.

(Exeunt.) 11:50 a.m.

MR. ORTIZ: We would like to welcome this

MR. MAYNARD: I think we should go into executive

session first and then call on Mr. Peterson either here

and a witness to digest this ourselves.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: At another day

MR. ALFORD: Possibly another day.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: All right.

I think we do ~~[illegible]~~ as this moment and we will

talk it over ourselves.

MR. ZIMMER: We will also present a little bit

because you might also have this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: I don't think we would ~~[illegible]~~

to do that because I think you have several if very ~~[illegible]~~ and

very well.

Thank you.

(Recess) 11:20 a.m.

MR. WALKER: I think that was a very fine presentation.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Very good presentation.

MR. WALKER: An interesting morning, very interesting morning. I was not bored at all.

MR. PERRY: Could I ask Felix DeWeldon what he thought of Mr. Jennewein's presentation, the sculptor?

MR. DeWELDON: I don't think he made the presentation as a sculptor.

MR. PERRY: What force did it have?

MR. DeWELDON: He only spoke of the technical aspects of the material.

MR. RAPUANO: He made the statement that this was not sculpture.

MR. WALKER: Would you think this was sculpture, Felix?

MR. DeWELDON: It is a sculptural form.

MR. WALKER: Sculptural form?

MR. DeWELDON: A sculptural form, but.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is not sculpture as we understand sculptors.

Have steles been used in such a monumental size?

MR. WALKER: I once did a composition for the Chicago War Memorial. I used a whole group of steles. Lint

MR. WALKER: I think that was a very fine presenta-

tion.

CHAIRMAN KINSEY: Very good presentation.

MR. WALKER: An interesting morning, very interest-

ing morning. I was not bored at all.

MR. PENNY: Could I ask Delia Dewindon what he

thought of Mr. Pennewin's presentation, the sculptor?

MR. DeWINDON: I don't think he made the presenta-

tion as a sculptor.

MR. PENNY: What force did it have?

MR. DeWINDON: He only spoke of the technical

aspects of the material.

MR. RAPUANO: He made the statement that this was

not sculpture.

MR. WALKER: Would you think this was sculpture,

Delia?

MR. DeWINDON: It is a sculptural form.

MR. WALKER: Sculptural form?

MR. DeWINDON: A sculptural form, but.

CHAIRMAN KINSEY: It is not sculpture as we under-

stand sculpture.

Have steles been used in such a monumental case?

MR. WALKER: I once did a composition for the

Chicago War Memorial. I used a whole group of steles. Like

said he had a photograph of it. It was formalized with statues. I didn't win the competition. Eric Gugler won it -- the same as I didn't win this competition here, but that doesn't change my mind.

In many ways, this is one of the most interesting solutions that was offered in this competition that I saw.

MR. ORR: I think there is no question about it.

MR. WALKER: No question about it. Whether it belongs there, whether it can be reformed into something without spoiling it, into something I would say a little more tightly woven -- and they are a little concerned about some of these loose ends themselves.

We talked about it a while ago.

MR. PERRY: I said yesterday, in terms of what John Harbeson said, namely, the competition is to choose the architect. It was a little short. I thought we might give him a hint. Inasmuch as he was the first one to say it was an esquisse, but he came up and had quite a different attitude.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Will you talk one at a time so he can get it in the record.?

MR. PERRY: Well, anyway, while Ralph is for the moment, and he began this, and I want him to continue this, that in the background of my mind is a very important problem which I would like to have resolved: Is this architecture or

MR. PERRY: Well, anyway, while Ralph is for the moment, and he began this, and I want him to continue this, that in the background of my mind is a very important problem which I would like to have resolved: Is this architecture or

CHAIRMAN TIMLEY: Will you talk one at a time so he can get it in the record.?

an sculpture, but he came up with a different attitude.

him a hint. Inasmuch as he was the first one to say it was

architect. It was a little short. I thought we might give

John Parsson said, exactly. The competition is to choose the

MR. PERRY: I said yesterday, in terms of what

We talked about it a while ago.

some of these loose ends themselves.

more tightly woven -- and they are a little concerned about

without spoiling it, into something I would say a little

belongs there, whether it can be returned into something

MR. MALCOMB: No question about it. Whether it

MR. GEER: I think there is no question about it.

solutions that was offered in that competition that I was.

In many ways, this is one of the most interesting

doesn't change my mind.

— the same as I didn't win this competition here, but that

statues. I didn't win the competition. Eric Gugler won it

said he had a photograph of it. It was furnished with

is it sculpture?

Why do I mention that?

Simply because I felt that Mr. Jennewein had not made a case for sculpture at all.

MR. DeWELDON: No.

MR. PERRY: Therefore, we have unfortunately lost in the presentation that was made today, I being a layman of that type, some guiding principles which would lead me to believe that an architect can work into sculpture and vice versa, and that is a flowing art form.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Bill, wouldn't you say that perhaps the Washington Monument is a sculpture, would you say, and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials are architecture?

MR. DeWELDON: The Lincoln Memorial is architecture and sculpture combined, but most people who go to the Lincoln Memorial, they don't read the inscription because they know the inscription, but when they look at the face of Lincoln, his brooding face and his expression and his humanity, it appeals to them. That appeals to French-speaking people, Arabic people, Chinese-speaking people.

If any foreigner comes here, he doesn't know that this monument is all about, it doesn't give him an image of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If we look at the great statue of Rameses, we see

If we look at the great statue of Ramses, we see
this monument is all about. It doesn't give him an image of
Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If any foreigner comes here, he doesn't know that
Arabic people, Chinese-speaking people.
appeals to them. This appeals to French-speaking people,
the inscription, but when they look at the face of Lincoln,
Memorial, they don't read the inscription because they know
and sculpture combined, but most people who go to the Lincoln
the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials are Architecture?

MR. DeWITT: The Lincoln Memorial is Architecture
time Washington Monument is a monument, would you say, and
in the presentation that you made today. I think a lot of
that type, some existing principles which lead me to
believe that an architect can work into sculpture and vice
versa, and that is a flowing art form.

Why do I mention that?

Simply because I felt that Mr. Thompson had not
made a case for sculpture at all.

MR. THOMPSON: Why

MR. PENNY: Therefore, we have misdemeanly lost

Is it sculpture?

his power, his strength. They are all heiroglyphics behind, written -- we don't know what they said -- some Egyptologist can translate them -- but we still probably get more from that statue than if you read that inscription.

MR. RAPUANO: In other words, this is an abstraction as against realism.

MR. DeWELDON: I am not ---

MR. WALKER: The Rameses is abstract, too.

MR. DeWELDON: The expression of Rameses, the sternness, simplicity -- it is very abstract. It is a spiritual thing which the beholder gets.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The pyramid?

MR. DeWELDON: I am speaking about the statue of Rameses.

MR. WALKER: It is a very interesting thing. The first time in 1920 when I went through the British Museum I came away thinking how marvelous the portraits were of the Romans and how marvelous Greek sculpture was.

The second time I can away with the feeling that the portraits of the Egyptians were far more important than the portraits of the Romans, even in the stiff positions which were true portraits, true portraits of spirituality in back of them, not just photographic things.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I feel about this that the

CHAIRMAN KINLEY: I feel about this that the

in book of them, not just photographic things.

subject gets these portraits, these portraits of spirituality

the portraits of the Romans, even in the stiff positions

the portraits of the Egyptians were far more important than

The second time I can say with the feeling that

Romans and how marvelous Greek sculpture was.

time in 1900 when I went through the British Museum I

first

MR. MALKEMUS: It is a very interesting thing. The

Ramses.

MR. DeWEERDT: I am speaking about the statue of

CHAIRMAN KINLEY: The personality

spiritual thing which the beholder gets.

eternens, simplicity -- it is very abstract. It is a

MR. DeWEERDT: The expression of Ramses, the

MR. MALKEMUS: The Egyptians is abstract, too.

MR. DeWEERDT: I am not ---

tion as against realism.

MR. MALKEMUS: In other words, this is an abstrac-

statue than if you read that inscription.

can translate them -- but we still presently get more from the

written -- we don't know what they said -- even Egyptologist

his power, his strength. They are all hieroglyphics behind,

location is unfortunate for this particular form of memorial.

In fact, in authorizing the competition I recognized the Act of Congress, the composition for the proposed memorial should be carried out so as to insure it willbe harmonious in location, design, land use, with the Washington, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. WALKER: I would like to find out by following it through a little bit because I think we owe it to Judge Biddle a little bit, whether we can make this thing come a little truer to that before we turn it down or accept it.

That is why I suggested that we have the architect come in.

I think we have really got to do some homework on this.

We really have to sit down and think about what we have seen, and so on and so forth, have got to have some reasons for what we are doing rather than just emotion and feeling against it because I still feel that the thing is so loose it would be rather unhappy.

Yet I am not so sure it cannot be organized, after looking at it again all day.

MR. ORR: I feel the scale is way off.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. WALKER: The scale is too big.

location is unfortunate for this particular form of memorial.

In fact, in soliciting the competition I realised the Act of Congress, the competition for the proposed memorial should be started out so as to insure it utilize memorials in location, design, land use, with the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. WALKER: I would like to find out by following it through a little bit because I think we owe it to Judge Gladly a little bit, whether we can make this going some little truer to that before we turn it down or accept it.

That is why I suggested that we have the architect come in.

I think we have really got to do some homework on this.

We really have to sit down and think about what we have seen, and so on and so forth, have got to have some reasons for what we are doing rather than just emotion and feeling against it because I still feel that the thing is so loose it would be rather unhappy.

Yet I am not so sure it cannot be organized, after looking at it again all day.

MR. OHR: I feel the scale is way off.

MR. WALKER: The scale is too big.

MR. ORR: The sculpture in a landscape would not be of that scale, a slab 165 feet high, a terrific slab.

MR. WALKER: I do like something which I hadn't realized before which is the modeling of the landscape.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it is harmonious.

MR. ORR: No, no.

MR. WALKER: I think this may take its own place if it is well done.

MR. ORR: This is something you can't answer immediately.

One thing -- Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. WALKER: I am still concerned about the concrete because of the fact that these are enormous pylons of concrete.

MR. PERRY: I was amazed to hear Mr. Pederson take two almost diametrically opposed positions, diametrically opposed with regard to the practicability in the use of concrete in one session.

MR. HURD: The marble session.

MR. PERRY: He was ready to put the marble off.

MR. RAPUANO: After Johnson finished.

MR. PERRY: If his mind ---

MR. WALKER: Johnson did that damn swell looking

MR. WALKER: I do like something which I don't

before which is the modeling of the landscape.

MR. OAR: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: I think this may have the opportunity

if it is well done.

MR. OAR: This is something you can't answer im-

mediately.

One thing -- Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. WALKER: I am still concerned about the con-

crete because of the fact that these are enormous pylons of

concrete.

opposed with regard to the practicality in the use of

concrete in one session.

MR. RUSK: The [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: He was going to put them right off.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Johnson thinks.

MR. [illegible]: It was my [illegible] ---

MR. WALKER: Johnson did that damn swell looking

concrete structure in Israel.

MR. ORR: This place has a different climate.

MR. WALKER: This thing in Coventry is just overpowering in its beauty, the slenderness, the delicacy in which the concrete is done. It is beautiful, but every one of those sections, a concrete lamellate roof, and cantilever have been pre-stressed and pre-fabricated so that actually the joints come where they should come and the doors come that way, too.

MR. PERRY: The joints could make a pattern.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Isn't it true that steel will react in a different way to hot and cold than concrete will and therefore you undoubtedly will have cracks?

MR. PERRY: May I emphasize the high, I will call it powerful -- I called it almost an explosion of very eloquent emotion this morning -- almost persuaded me to be a Christian.

MR. HURD: In the presentation?

MR. PERRY: It was very, very impressive.

MR. HURD: The presentation?

MR. PERRY: But the trouble was that concrete will not stand up. The trouble is that it is not American, as much as Johnson said, this one American thing. It is as international as the style is international.

concrete structure in Israel.

MR. OHR: This place has a different climate.

MR. WALKER: This thing in Coventry is just overpowering in its beauty, the slenderness, the delicacy in which the concrete is done. It is beautiful, but every one of those Apricots, a concrete lamellae roof, has conflicts have been pre-stressed and pre-fabricated so that actually they could come and the doors come that way, too.

MR. PERRY: The joints could make a pattern.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Isn't it true that steel will react in a different way to hot and cold than concrete will and therefore you undoubtedly will have cracks?

MR. PERRY: May I emphasize the high, I will call it powerful -- I called it almost an explosion of very eloquent emotion this morning -- almost persuaded me to be a Christian.

MR. [illegible]: In the presentation?

MR. PERRY: It was very, very impressive.

MR. HUNT: The presentation?

MR. PERRY: But the trouble was that concrete will not stand up. The trouble is that it is not American, as much as Johnson said, this one American thing. It is as international as the style is international.

Third, as Felix has said, and I had not thought of it at the time, it is not easily interpreted by those who have not been told in advance that this is what it is; and when they get there and they are speaking a foreign language, they still do not know.

MR. WALKER: I am not so concerned about that.

MR. PERRY: A minor matter, perhaps.

MR. WALKER: 7,200,000 Americans come here annually who, I hope, read English.

MR. ORR: Not at this height.

MR. WALKER: That is one of the difficulties.

MR. PERRY: I sat back and said, if it cannot be built, I am against it.

MR. WALKER: This is one of the things I want to talk to our engineers about. I would like to find out what they think about this thing.

MR. ORR: All the engineers will tell you is that they can do it but they are not responsible for it after it is done.

MR. WALKER: If they will tell us just exactly what might happen. We have it in our office.

MR. ORR: There is a new method of building a slab like that called an ellipse form or some such thing where it is a continuous pour.

MR. WALKER: No, you do not. Look at the flight

MR. WALKER: 7,200,000 Americans come here annually who, I hope, read English.

MR. PERRY: I set back and said, if it cannot be built, I am against it.

MR. WALKER: This is one of the difficulties.

MR. ORR: All the engineers will tell you is that they can do it but they are not responsible for it after it is done.

MR. WALKER: This is one of the things I want to talk to our engineers about. I would like to find out what they think about this ruling.

MR. WALKER: If they will tell us just exactly what might happen. We have it in our office.

MR. ORR: There is a new method of building a slab like that called an elliptic (or some such thing where it is a continuous pour.

MR. WALKER: No, you do not. Look at the flight

tower at LaGuardia. Have you seen it?

That is done under that mold and every damn pour is there. Whereas, most of it is continuous ---

MR. PERRY: Never did lift slabbing in my life.

MR. WALKER: Actually, you cannot get away from the pour marks because the very nature of the material does not permit you to have consistency. It changes.

MR. HURD: Is there any abrasive that could be used to erase the marks?

MR. RAPUANO: If you put a bush hammer on ---

MR. WALKER: You will break through again and again because we tried to imitate Perry, very marvelous thing, with a bush hammer. That was a hand bush hammer with one of the finest number of points to the bush hammer, and beautiful, but you can't get anybody in this country to do that. They use an electric hammer. By the time you get through with that, the damn thing goes.

We tried it up at the IBM place, to have an exposed concrete bush hammer and, my God, when we got through we had more holes than when we took the ---

MR. PERRY: You disturbed the matrix behind. You disturbed the brownstone.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, do you think that we then might possibly delay this until the next meeting, and I think that I agree with Douglas Orr that we ought to have the

tower at Lockwards. Have you been in?

That is done under that cold one every damn year

is there. Whereas, most of it is nonsense ---

MR. PERRY: Never did like standing in my life.

MR. WALKER: Anyway, you cannot get away from

the pour marks because the very nature of the material does

not permit you to have consistency. It changes.

MR. HAMM: Is there any abrasive that could be used

to erase the marks?

MR. RAPUANO: If you put a bush hammer on ---

MR. WALKER: You will break through again and again

because we tried to imbrute joints, very smooth joints, with

a bush hammer. That was a hand bush hammer with one of the

finest number of points to the bush hammer, and beautiful.

but you can't get anybody in this country to do that. They

use an electric hammer. By the time you get through with

that, the damn thing goes.

We tried it up at the KEM place, to have an exposed

concrete bush hammer and, my God, when we got through we had

more holes than when we took the ---

MR. PERRY: You disturbed the matrix behind. You

disturbed the brownstone.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, do you think that we

then might possibly have this until our next meeting, and I

sculptor down there, too, and that we take the real time to study it, meanwhile have our own questions resolved in our own minds.

I will have some questions resolved at home and we can do it at that time and we can spend really just as much time as we have this morning because I think we will need it.

MR. ORR: I think we will need all that time. I think we ought to put the entire morning in on it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Shall we have the sculptor down for the executive session?

MR. ORR: No.

MR. WALKER: The sculptor for the executive session? Yes, because he is part and parcel of this.

MR. RAPUANO: We ought to talk about it before we have him in.

MR. WALKER: We ought to talk about this ourselves, on Tuesday.

MR. RAPUANO: May I ask the question, Mr. Chairman: Are we to judge this as a design being shown to us today or are we to judge this in the light of the possibility of a certain amount of change in this particular scheme?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Pederson ---

MR. RAPUANO: He told me he didn't want to change it except possibly pull it in. He asked him about the number

study it, meanwhile have our own questions received in our

own minds.

I will have some questions resolved at home and we

can do it at that time and we can spend really just as much

time as we have this morning because I think we will need it.

MR. ORR: I think we will need all that time.

I think we ought to put the entire morning in on it.

REPRESENTATIVE KELSEY: Shall we have the sculptor down

for the executive session?

MR. ORR: No.

MR. WALKER: The sculptor for the executive session?

Yes, because he is part and parcel of this.

MR. RAPUANO: We ought to talk about it before we

have him in.

MR. WALKER: We ought to talk about this ourselves,

on Tuesday.

MR. RAPUANO: May I ask the question, Mr. Chairman:

Are we to judge this as a design being shown to us today or

are we to judge this in the light of the possibility of a

certain amount of change in this particular scheme?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Pedersen ---

MR. RAPUANO: He told me he didn't want to change

it except possibly pull it in. He asked him about the number

steles. He said absolutely not change the number of steles.

MR. ORR: But just a question of bringing it in a little tighter.

I am just wondering whether we are in a position to make recommendations as to the design, to accepting this as an idea and then trying to go from there, or whether we are to say yes or no on this.

MR. WALKER: That is the point that he was raising, whether before that next meeting he might have the benefit of Doug Orr's advice, your advice, my advice, in New York, because we were there, and see whether we could not come to some decision and bring up and further discuss at this meeting in Washington.

If that is a favorable thing to do, I am perfectly willing to do it.

MR. PERRY: Are you suggesting that we do not meet after lunch today?

MR. WALKER: Yes, I do. Not on this. I am finished.

MR. PERRY: I do not feel competent to think this all out by myself. I do not feel competent to think this all out by myself.

MR. ORR: I would like to have a round on it this afternoon.

MR. ORR: I would like to have a round on it this afternoon.

MR. PERRY: I do not feel competent to think this all out by myself. I do not feel competent to think this all out by myself.

MR. WALKER: Yes, I do. Not on this. I am finished.

MR. PERRY: Are you suggesting that we do not meet after lunch today?

It that is a favorable thing to do, I am perfectly willing to do it.

ing in Washington.

some decision and bring on our further dispute at this meet- because we were there, and see whether we could not come to Doug Orr's advice, your advice, my advice, in New York,

to say yes or no on this.

MR. ORR: But just a question of bringing it in a little lighter.

I am just wondering whether we are in a position to

steles. He said absolutely not change the number of steles.

MR. WALKER: Not me. I am tired of it.

MR. RAPUANO: Can we have a special meeting some time?

MR. WALKER: You go ahead. I have reasons.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Let me ask you, are we justified in asking ---

MR. RAPUANO: A little meeting in New York between now and ---

MR.PERRY: You want Peter Hurd here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are we justified in asking the sculptor to change his deisgn for the monument, to make a really fundamental change in it of any kind?

MR. RAPUANO: We did on the Boy Scouts. That is a question I am asking.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is a competition, yes.

MR. RAPUANO: It has been judged as a design.

MR. HURD: It seems to be that the real crux of this thing is its adaptability to other surroundings much more than its design which is so completely out, away from everything else, away out in front, that I don't know how we could change it in any way without making a completely different one. So assuming it has to be as it is, as Mr. Pederson said, he is not about to make any great changes, it looks to me that we like it or do not like it, on the strength of its

MR. MAPUANO: Can we have a special meeting some time?

MR. WALKER: Yes to ahead. I have reasons.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are we justified in asking ---

MR. MAPUANO: A little meeting in New York between now and ---

MR. PERRY: Can make their need more.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are we justified in asking the acceptor to change the design for the economy, to make a really fundamental change to it of any kind?

MR. MAPUANO: We did on the Boy Scouts. That is a question I am asking.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is a competition, yes.

MR. MAPUANO: It has been judged as a design.

MR. HURD: It seems to be that the real crux of this being is the acceptability to other governing authority more than its design which is so completely out, away from everything else, away out in front, that I don't know how we could change it in any way without making a completely different one. So assuming it has to be as it is, as Mr. Pederson said, he is not about to make any great changes, it looks to me that we like it or do not like it, on the strength of its

compatibility with other things.

I feel you cannot evaluate a piece of contemporary art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I know of a case where Claude Monet's paintings were attacked by violent anti-modernist protagonists with acid and with ink. Who knows that the future is going to say?

On the other hand, they may accept it with the most wonderful benign paintings.

MR. ORR: There are two fundamental things. One, of course, is the design itself. The other is the construction of it.

MR. HURD: I agree with you.

MR. ORR: That is just as fundamental as the design.

MR. WALKER: It can be constructed but what will it look like?

MR. ORR: What I am saying, Ralph, I am not willing to approve something that I know perfectly well in ten years is going to look like something the cat brought in.

MR. PERRY: That is basic.

MR. HURD: The difference ---

MR. WALKER: I would like to find out some more

MR. ORR: Thank you very much, Mr. Hurd.

Mr. Walker, I'm sure you have a few words to say.

MR. WALKER: I feel that I have been very much misunderstood. I am not opposed to anything that is going to look like something the cat brought in. I am not opposed to anything that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art. I am not opposed to anything that is going to look like something the cat brought in. I am not opposed to anything that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art. I am not opposed to anything that is going to look like something the cat brought in.

MR. HURD: That is basic.

MR. ORR: The difference ---

MR. WALKER: I would like to find out some more

about it. I am not opposed to anything that is going to look like something the cat brought in. I am not opposed to anything that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art. I am not opposed to anything that is going to look like something the cat brought in.

MR. ORR: What I am saying, Ralph, I am not willing to approve something that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I know of a case where Claude Monet's paintings were attacked by violent anti-modernist propagandists with acid and with ink. Who knows that the future is going to say?

On the other hand, they may accept it with the most wonderful benign paintings.

MR. ORR: There are two fundamental things. One, of course, is the design itself. The other is the construction of it.

MR. HURD: I agree with you.

MR. ORR: That is just as fundamental as the design.

MR. WALKER: It can be constructed but what will it look like?

MR. ORR: What I am saying, Ralph, I am not willing

to approve something that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I feel you cannot evaluate a piece of contemporary

art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I know of a case where Claude Monet's paintings were attacked by violent anti-modernist propagandists with acid and with ink. Who knows that the future is going to say?

On the other hand, they may accept it with the most wonderful benign paintings.

MR. ORR: There are two fundamental things. One, of course, is the design itself. The other is the construction of it.

MR. HURD: I agree with you.

MR. ORR: That is just as fundamental as the design.

MR. WALKER: It can be constructed but what will it look like?

MR. ORR: What I am saying, Ralph, I am not willing to approve something that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I feel you cannot evaluate a piece of contemporary

art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

I know of a case where Claude Monet's paintings were attacked by violent anti-modernist propagandists with acid and with ink. Who knows that the future is going to say?

On the other hand, they may accept it with the most wonderful benign paintings.

MR. ORR: There are two fundamental things. One, of course, is the design itself. The other is the construction of it.

MR. HURD: I agree with you.

MR. ORR: That is just as fundamental as the design.

MR. WALKER: It can be constructed but what will it look like?

MR. ORR: What I am saying, Ralph, I am not willing

to approve something that I know perfectly well in ten years will be accepted as a work of art on how the future is going to like it. Our opinions have been so often reversed.

about concrete, frankly. This thing at Coventry, I think, is beautiful. I think it is enduring.

MR. PERRY: How large is that? What is the size?

MR. WALKER: The columns are 80 feet high. They come down to a base of 12 inches, approximately, and go up to a capital of about two-foot-six. So that is one of the most slender things you ever saw. They were cast on the principle of concrete telegraph poles and that sort of thing, pre-stressed, under one pour. So actually the whole thing is, you find it all in one piece.

MR. HURD: It hasn't suffered?

MR. WALKER: Hasn't been up there long enough. I went and examined every one of the columns.

MR. HURD: Is this not true that in Britain they never get really freezing temperatures? Not much?

MR. ORR: They get some.

MR. WALKER: This is not outdoors. This is indoors.

MR. HURD: Here the difference in coefficients of expansion, and the reinforcing materials and the surrounding material must be tremendous with our difference in temperature here.

MR. WALKER: How many of you have seen the new library out here at Bethesda that Bob O'Connor and Walter Killiam did? It is a concrete face but all the pours are

MR. PERRY: How large is that? What is the size?

MR. WALKER: The columns are 80 feet high. They come down to a base of 12 inches, approximately, and go up to a capital of about two-foot-six. So that is one of the most wonderful things you ever saw. They were cast on the principle of concrete telegraph poles and that sort of thing, pre-stressed, under one pour. So normally the whole thing, you find it all in one piece.

MR. HURD: It hasn't suffered?

MR. WALKER: Hasn't been up there long enough. I went and examined every one of the columns.

MR. HURD: Is this not true that in Britain they never get really freezing temperatures? Not much?

MR. ORR: They get some.

MR. WALKER: This is not outdoors. This is indoors.

MR. HURD: Here the difference in coefficients of expansion, and the reinforcing materials and the surrounding material must be tremendous with our difference in temperature here.

MR. WALKER: How many of you have been to the new library out here at Bethesda that Dean O'Connor and Walter Killam did? It is a concrete face but all the beams are

there. The only thing they did was equalize the pours so that every day you got the same place going around, or apparently around on every panel. The panels are very big and it is perfectly all right.

I do not know what it is going to look like, whether they are going to surface it or not. I don't know. But the thing is rather impressive.

I think we are going to see more concrete, there is no question about it in my mind. I think it is the material.

I think the argument about its plasticity -- this is a concrete form -- has some validity.

MR. PERRY: We are not discussing the immediate appearance of concrete which we all accept. There are examples downstairs in the museum, Mr. Chairman, of the Boulder Dam where there is some very fine, we have done almost with a water wash, as you do terrazzo, but it is the long term we are all considering, which I call basic.

I make simply this suggestion that if, as everybody knows, there is a finite or maximum size of glass and another one of stone, there is another one of diamond. Those are recognized and you can't stretch those points. You can't go to a quarry and get something bigger than you can get out of a quarry.

I think the argument about its plasticity -- this is a concrete form -- has some validity.

MR. [illegible]: We are not discussing the immediate appearance of concrete which we all accept. There are examples downstairs in the museum, Mr. Chairman, of the Boulder Dam where there is some very fine, we have done almost with a water wash, as you do terrazzo, but it is the long term we are all concerned, which I call basic.

I make simply this suggestion that it, as everybody knows, there is a limits or maximum size of glass and another one of stone, there is another one of diamond. Those are recognized and you can't stretch those points. You can't go to a quarry and get something bigger than you can get out of a quarry.

We are now ignoring that and saying we can pour this because you can pour it.

We are now saying that you can, yes, you can pour it but what is it going to be after all these stresses have had their say?

It occurs to me possibly that there might be, in making inquiries from really experienced people, not necessarily hopeful concrete engineers, a maximum size which they would assure the Commission and others have been able to withstand the pressures, internally, that we are now discussing.

I also say if that is the case we have a maximum size beyond which the sculptor who takes a great risk, and given that size, he would do precisely what I would do with smaller pieces of masonry, and design a pattern which was not to be a sheer mass of vulnerable surface, but one carefully designed, recognizing the fine art limitations of the material with which he is building.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could you architect members undertake to get that opinion from the engineers?

MR. PERRY: I cannot think that out. I don't know what that is.

MR. WALKER: I can. We have it in our own office.

MR. PERRY: The thinness of this worries me.

MR. ORR: That slab there which is standing in

section, it is thin on one side and not on the other. It is going to move, that cantilevered slab there, that vertical slab.

MR. HURD: Three inches of movement allowed.

MR. WALKER: It will move.

MR. ORR: I am talking about the one side of a concrete slab and the other.

MR. WALKER: The one hot and the other cold. That is where the buildings turn, not from wind.

MR. ORR: Saarinen, with the dome in MIT -- it took them forever to get windows in because they couldn't hold it down long enough to put windows in.

MR. PERRY: It is an expansive type of roof covering on that building.

MR. HURD: The dome?

MR. PERRY: Yes. It is in trouble all the time.

The Fuller Company are working on it.

Let me say that one thing has not been brought out except by mentioning it, namely, steel. I haven't heard anybody say that all the reinforcing is going to be stainless steel.

MR. WALKER: No.

MR. PERRY: Within three inches of the surface, and cracking, what are you going to do unless you are reinforcing

MR. PERRY: It is an expensive type of roof covering on that building.

MR. ORR: Is it?

MR. PERRY: Yes. It is in trouble all the time.

The Fuller Company are working on it.

Let me say that one thing has not been brought out except by mentioning it, namely, steel. I haven't heard anybody say what it's reinforcing is going to be stainless steel.

MR. WALKER: No.

MR. PERRY: Within three inches of the surface, and

with bronze? What is that going to cost?

MR. ORR: It is going to cost another million dollars to put stainless steel reinforcing in it.

MR. PERRY: How can they proceed with the normal reinforcement on a slab as thin as that?

MR. HURD: That is what I am wondering.

MR. PERRY: When you have permanent considerations ---

MR. WALKER: You have in other climates besides the hot and cold, you have the heat and cold of temperature of the day and night. In Asswan the temperature drops 60 degrees from the heat of the day.

The problem then of concrete movement has to be thought of in hot climates as well as it does in cold climates.

I remember the first time I was down in Cuba in Oriente Province and went to play golf -- I still played golf at that time -- I dropped a putter in a crack in the earth. The earth had cracked so much that actually it was the whole length of the puetter reached down and I had to pull it up. It had gone down three feet, the crack from the sun.

So you do have these problems in foreign countries, as well.

MR. PERRY: I would like to add one very precautionary thought.

Concrete is stone, isn't it? It is on the borderline.

as well.

MR. PERRY: I would like to add one very pressing thought:

Concrete is stone, isn't it? It is on the borderline

The Romans used it with great skill.

When you emphasize climate, I am with you.

Actually, there are such things as brownstone that will stand up in our climate.

There also brownstones taken from the same quarry within twenty feet which will not, where the water crystallization will form on the surface and there will be a little crack of some kind and it will fall off, as we all know.

This happens in all residential work, cemeteries, and what is the cause of all that?

The cause is not the water. The water is simply the colaborator that comes along and says, "I will finish this for you."

The cause is much deeper than that. The cause is in the release of pressures which are not expected to demand release in masses of concrete and of stone.

There they are. They are put down, concrete not under any more pressure than its own weight, but in geology those stones are put under an amazing pressure, incalculable.

You bring it out. It looks exactly like a piece which has been standing up, we will say, six years that this came out. There are forces in there which once where the pressure is released work slowly, a fifth column in architecture, if you like.

The Romans used it with great skill.

When you determine climate, I do write you.

Naturally, there are many things we brainstorm that will stand up in our climate.

There also bromstones taken from the same quarry within twenty feet whose will not, where the water crystallization will form on the surface and there will be a little crack of open kind but it will fall off, in me all keen.

Jobs happens in all residential work, semesters, and what is the cause of all that?

The cause is not the water. The water is simply the carbonator that comes along and says, "I will finish this for you."

The cause is much deeper than that. The cause is in the release of pressures which are not expected to demand release in masses of concrete and of stone.

There they are. They are put down, constrict but under only more pressure than its own weight, but is evolved those stones are put under an amazing pressure, instantly. You bring it out. It looks exactly like a piece which has been removed up, we will say, via Yazoo that was came out. There are forces in there which once where the pressure is released more slowly, a fifth column in structure, if you like.

You are accomplishing something very, very important to know the limitations of concrete.

MR. DeWELDON: We observe in all stone which is quarried, if the stone was deep in the mountain, it was under great pressure and it is not suitable for carving for statuary. You have to take the stone from the top of the mountain where there was less pressure because the moment the tremendous weight of the stone above is taken off, the pressure still continues and the stone falls apart. It is not immediate, but it takes time.

MR. PERRY: I submit that pressure at the bottom of that long stele is going to be different from the pressure at the top.

You have some problems.

MR. WALKER: They will move, but I think the movement of the thing, if they are able to reinforce it properly, can be taken care of, but I do not think there is any question about that.

MR. RAPUANO: It is possible, this being a plastic or fluid design, to construct this of bronze in some way, or other?

MR. DeWELDON: It would be quite easy to do in bronze.

MR. WALKER: What they are looking for is a jointless

MR. DOWNSON: We observe an all stone bridge in
Quarter, if the stone was deep in the mountain, it was under
great pressure and it is not suitable for carving for
statuary. You have to take the stone from the top of the
mountain where there was less pressure because the weight
pressure will continue and the stone fails apart. It is
not immediate, but it takes time.

MR. PUDDY: I imagine that pressure at the bottom
of that load stone is going to be different from the pressure
at the top.

You have some problems.

MR. WALKER: They will move, but I think the move-
ment of the wing, if they are able to rehabcrete it properly,
can be taken care of, but I do not think there is any question
about that.

MR. RAPUANO: It is possible, this being a plastic
or fluid design, to counteract this of stress in some way,
or other?

MR. DOWNSON: It would be quite easy to do in
stress.

MR. WALKER: What they are looking for is a picture

quality through these stele. They want to get the sense of massiveness.

MR. ORR: Monolith.

MR. DeWELDON: Bronze can be welded together.

MR. WALKER: Then you have the joint.

MR. RAPUANO: You can get rid of that.

MR. HURD: You are speaking of reinforcing.

MR. RAPUANO: I am asking a question.

MR. WALKER: The color comes into this question, also.

MR. RAPUANO: It is poured the same as concrete.

MR. DeWELDON: This form is neither bronze, nor is it a cotter, clay form.

MR. PERRY: Like slate, shale.

MR. RAPUANO: Is this a fluid or plastic form?

MR. DeWELDON: Yes, it is.

MR. RAPUANO: Bronze is plastic. It is a fluid.

MR. DeWELDON: Bronze is metal.

MR. RAPUANO: You pour it.

MR. DeWELDON: Yes, but you don't pour it massive. You pour it hollow.

MR. ORR: That apparently has a concrete frame. That particular stele is four feet thick in the top and eight feet at the bottom, apparently a concrete frame, hollow

quality smudge hand cycle. They want to get two sets of
answers.

MR. ORR: Monolith.

MR. DEWELDON: Bronze can be mixed together.

MR. WALKER: Then you have the joint.

MR. RAPUANO: You can get rid of that.

MR. MEEK: You are speaking of Waterford.

MR. RAPUANO: I am saying a question.

MR. WALKER: The color leans like junk question
also.

MR. RAPUANO: It is poured the same as concrete.

MR. DEWELDON: This form is neither bronze, nor is
it a pewter, glass form.

MR. PERRY: Like right, right.

MR. RAPUANO: Is this a fluid or plastic form?

MR. DEWELDON: Yes, it is.

MR. RAPUANO: Bronze is plastic. It is a fluid.

MR. DEWELDON: Bronze is metal.

MR. WALKER: Yes you do.

MR. DEWELDON: Yes, but you don't pour it massive.
You pour it below.

MR. ORR: That apparently has a concrete frame.
That particular area is four feet thick in the top and right
feet at the bottom, apparently a concrete frame, hollow

MR. WALKER: Built the way silos are built. That is what I am trying to find out.

I don't know enough about this, either.

MR. PERRY: I don't, either.

MR. WALKER: So I am speechless. I am like the labor leader.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: May I ask this question because I don't see how one can get around it, that Congress gave the money for the site and competition with the condition that the design should be harmonious as to location, design, and use of these monuments.

MR. WALKER: Harmonious. Is Stravinsky harmonious in the line of music or not?

This is one of the things that you have to comeup with and figure out.

MR. HURD: I would say not in the same way.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It towers over the other two monuments. It would be the first thing you would see against the skyline. I do not think it is harmonious at all. I do not think anything you are going to do is going to make it harmonious.

MR. WALKER: I think you can. I think you can get rid of some of the irrationalism and still have the effect they would like to have.

MR. WALKER: Built the way atlas are built. That is what I am trying to find out.

I don't know enough about this, either.

MR. IWERY: I don't, either.

MR. WALKER: So I am speechless. I am like the Labor Leader.

I don't see how one can get around it, that Congress gave the money for the site and construction and the condition that the design should be harmonious as to location, design, and use of these monuments.

MR. WALKER: Harmonious. Is Jefferson Memorial in the line of music or not?

This is one of the things that you have to consult with and figure out.

MR. HUND: I would say not in the same way.

CHAIRMAN MURRAY: It towers over the other two monuments. It would be the first thing you would see against the skyline. I do not think it is harmonious at all. I do not think anything you are going to do is going to make it harmonious.

MR. WALKER: I think you can. I think you can get rid of some of the irrelevancies and still have the effect they would like to have.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you think in another site it might be possible?

MR. WALKER: The thing is a bit loose. The way I feel about it, it is a little bit loose. It doesn't hang together. I think it is a very brilliant idea but it doesn't hang together in my estimation. I don't know whether it belongs there or on top of a hill as the Admiral indicated.

MR. HURD: It seems to me that another generation of these things or similar monuments, type of architecture, sculptural, are more commonplace, more usual, this will take its place in the scheme and it will be just as acceptable as Roman and Greek together now.

But I doubt if they will accept that scale. That is what bothers me. It seems so dominating.

MR. ORR: The scale is bad in that location.

The other point, that the design is based on the theory of building something in concrete.

MR. WALKER: That is why I think we are going around the same circle. I wanted to try to get out of that circle and go home and think about it.

I said, when it goes around for the fourth time, I get tired.

MR. ORR: This is a contemporary method of doing something.

MR. WALKER: The thing is a bit loose. The way I feel about it, it's a matter not loose. It doesn't hang together. I think it is a very affiliate idea but it doesn't hang together in my estimation. I don't know whether it belongs there or on top of a hill as the Admiral indicated.

MR. HEIN: If there is an ethic question of these things or similar connection, type of architecture, sculpture, more complicated, more usual, this will take its place in the scheme and it will be just as acceptable as Roman and Greek together now.

But I doubt if they will accept that scale. That is what bothers me. It seems so dominating.

MR. ORR: The scale is bad in that location.

The other point, that the design is based on the theory of building something in concrete.

MR. WALKER: That is why I think we are going around the same circle. I wanted to try to get out of that circle and go home and think about it.

I said, when it goes around for the fourth time, I get tired.

MR. ORR: This is a contemporary method of doing something.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mrs. Rowe asked if she could have a copy of the transcript of the testimony, and also the Communications worker -- who was the other man?

The Communications worker.

Is there any objection to giving a transcript of the testimony?

MR. ORR: I think it is all right to give it to Mrs. Rowe. I don't see why the others should have it, private organization.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Offered to pay for it.

MR. ORR: This is a Government agency. Mrs. Rowe's is a Government agency.

MR. RAPUANO: It gets out into the hands of the press.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The press has got it now.

Is it the understanding that a copy of the transcript will only be given to the Government agency, such as the Planning Commission across the hall?

MR. WALKER: Why? This was open to the press. The press heard all of this.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The press has got what we said this morning but the official copy of the transcript, Mrs. Rowe said she would like very much to have it. I think it would be proper for them to do so.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mrs. Howe asked if she could have a copy of the transcript of the testimony, and also the Communications worker -- one has the other and

The Communications worker.

Is there any objection to giving a transcript of the testimony?

MR. QUAT: I think it is all right to give it to Mrs. Howe. I don't see why the others should have it, private organization.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Offered to pay for it.

MR. QUAT: This is a Government Agency. Mrs. Howe's is a Government Agency.

MR. RAUBANO: It gets out into the hands of the press.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The press has got it now.

Is it the understanding that a copy of the transcript will only be given to the Government Agency, such as the Planning Commission across the hall?

MR. WALKER: Why? This was open to the press. The press heard all of this.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The press has got what we said this morning but the official copy of the transcript, Mrs. Howe said she would like very much to have it. I think it would be proper for them to do so.

The question was whether the Workers of America, the Communications section of the Workers of America, should also have a copy of the transcript.

MR. ORR: I don't think they should have an official copy.

MR. WALKER: There are parts of it I would like to have as a matter of reviewing the thing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You are a member.

MR. WALKER: I am thinking about it.

MR. WILSON: I think the transcript portrays only the speech, the portrayal of the speech of the Commission and some of the friends and some of the opponents. It doesn't have any of the ideas of the Commission involved in it so I think it can be given to anybody.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I see no objection.

MR. WALKER: As long as you had the press here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I see no harm in giving it to the Workers if they want it, if they are willing to pay for it.

MR. PERRY: Exclusive of that which took place this morning?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: This morning.

MR. PERRY: Not include what we are saying now or what we said before the meeting?

The question was raised the matter of justice, the Commissioner decision of the Workers of America, should also have a copy of the transcript.

MR. ORR: I don't think they should have an official copy.

MR. WALKER: There are parts of it I would like to have as a matter of reviewing the thing.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: You are a member.

MR. WALKER: I am thinking about it.

MR. WILSON: I think the transcript portrays only the speech, the portrayal of the speech of the committee and some of the friends and some of the opponents. It doesn't have any of the ideas of the Commission involved in it so I think it can be given to anybody.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: I see no objection.

MR. WALKER: As long as you had the press here.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: I see no harm in giving it to the Workers if they want it, if they are willing to pay for it.

MR. PERRY: Exclusive of that which took place this morning.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: This morning.

MR. PERRY: Not include what we are saying now or what we said before the meeting?

MR. WALKER: I am particularly interested in the two talks, Philip Johnson and one by Douglas Haskell, not because of the emotions they aroused, but from the standpoint that they did a beautiful job. They did it extemporaneously.

I would like to read it. I think Doug Haskell did a very beautiful job.

I would like to have the opportunity to read it. I am not interested in the rest.

MR. PERRY: I would like a copy of that.

MR. ORR: I would, too.

MR. WALKER: What more can we do?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think there is anything more.

MR. WALKER: Any reason why Walker and Rapuano and Orr shouldn't meet with these fellows? Do you want to come down, Bill?

MR. PERRY: Gladly, if I can be of any use.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it is all right provided you don't commit us to anything.

MR. WALKER: We don't commit. We suggest.

MR. ORR: That they bring it back.

MR. WALKER: We tell them we are delighted or not but that doesn't commit you at all.

I am not interested in the rest.

MR. PERRY: Ways and means.

We have Biddle in mind. He has his dates. Obviously, if you wait until the next meeting, something has interrupted.

We have the meeting of the Planning Board between this meeting and our next meeting.

MR. WALKER: Doesn't make much difference.

MR. PERRY: Implement anything we do today before the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: No. At the next meeting we have Mr. Pederson.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

- - -

RECEIVED
JAN 29 1952
NOTED

LORIMER RICH AND ASSOCIATES, *ARCHITECTS*
19 WEST 57TH STREET • NEW YORK 19, NEW YORK

LORIMER RICH, F.A.I.A.
HUGH C. PORTER, R.A.
MELVIN D. CAREY, R.A.

PLAZA 1-1270-71

January 12, 1962

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

It has come to my attention that the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial design will come before the Commission this Wednesday. I believe it is proper for me, as a competitor and architect of some experience, to address the following comments to the Commission.

The design is excellent and a fine solution of a most difficult problem. It is monumental and shows great imagination. It has the rare quality of not being similar to any other memorial. I hope the Commission will give it careful and favorable consideration.

I have heard that it is proposed to shield these monoliths with crushed marble aggregates pressed into precast slabs. It seems to me that if this is true, that this should receive most careful consideration. This memorial is built for the ages - it must look proper for many, many years. Do we yet know that concrete, no matter how it is treated, will stand the test of time and continually be a witness to the sentiments for which this monument is intended?

Sincerely yours,

Lorimer Rich

LR:rw

Lorimer Rich, F.A.I.A.

Exhibit B-1

HARRISON & ABRAMOVITZ
ARCHITECTS

630 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y.

WALLACE K. HARRISON
MAX ABRAMOVITZ

CHARLES H. ABBE
MICHAEL M. HARRIS
JOHN J. HEALY
GEORGE S. JOHNSTON

January 12, 1962

Mr. David Finley
Commission of Fine Arts
Room 7000, New Interior Dept. Building
18 and C Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear David:

I have talked to Pietro Belluschi about the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Competition and have changed my mind about appearing before the Fine Arts Commission, but, in the meantime, I am in such a jam on the seventeenth that I don't believe I can get away.

I am therefore forwarding this note of support for the Memorial as designed by Pedersen and Associates and as picked by the properly constituted Jury. I think it is a fine scheme and believe that it should be allowed to be built.

Sincerely,

Wallace K. Harrison

WKH:O
cc to Mr. Francis Biddle
Mr. Pietro Belluschi

Communications

J. A. BEIRNE, *President*

CWA

Workers of America

1.14

1925 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.
TELEPHONE: FEderal 7-7711

January 12, 1962

Mr. Linton R. Wilson, Secretary and
Administrative Officer
Commission of Fine Arts
Room 7000
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wilson:

I have been informed that Francis Biddle, Chairman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, will appear before your Commission on Wednesday, January 17, 1962 to inform the members of the action of his Commission in approving the award winning design for the Memorial with minor changes. Prior to this letter the interest of the Communications Workers of America has been confined to the simple proposition that a Memorial to our late beloved President should be erected as expeditiously as possible. The completion of the competition of a design and the selection of a winner together with the Memorial Commission's approval, causes us now to move strongly in support of the Commission's action.

Our reasons are twofold: (1) controversy over a proper design could continue ad infinitum and inaction would result; and (2) the Memorial should be erected in the lifetime of those who knew him so well and they should be permitted to contribute in every manner feasible to that end. With these thoughts in mind we sincerely and earnestly hope your Commission will endorse the design so the greater task of seeking public endorsement can be initiated.

Sincerely,

J. A. Beirne

J. A. Beirne
President

NATIONAL SCULPTURE SOCIETY

1083 FIFTH AVENUE • NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

February 14th, 1961.

PAUL MANSHIP
HONORARY PRESIDENT
PAUL JENNEWEIN
PRESIDENT
ADOLPH BLOCK
1ST VICE-PRESIDENT
FRANCIS KEALLY
2ND VICE-PRESIDENT
CLYDE C. TREES
TREASURER
ERT L. KAMMERER
SECRETARY
ELEANOR PLATT
RECORDING SECRETARY
LDRED J. AMABILE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
EODORA MORGAN
PUBLIC RELATIONS

COUNCIL
Lewis G. Adams
Bryant Baker
Granville W. Carter
Albino Cavallito
Frank Eliscu
Clara Fasano
Louis Féron
Paul Fjelde
Leo Friedlander
Maurice Gauthier
Walker Hancock
Thomas G. Lo Medico
Albino Manca
Moissaye Marans
Pietro Montana
Carl L. Schmitz
J. Kellum Smith, Jr.
Robert A. Weinman

ADVISORY BOARD
PAST PRESIDENTS
Paul Manship
Edmond Amateis
Donald De Lue
Sidney Waugh
Karl H. Gruppe
Wheeler Williams
Leo Friedlander
Adlai S. Hardin

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman,
The National Commission of Fine Arts,
7000 Interior Department Building,
1800 C.Street, N.W.
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The Press has noted the results of a competition for a Memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with illustrated articles. It is truly the most disturbing occurrence in the Art World seen for many a day.

The Council of The National Sculpture Society has asked me as President, to write to you in the name of all members of the Society, in order to express our feelings regarding the design selected by the Jury to memorialize President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We feel that it is completely out of keeping with the traditions of the great Memorials to be found in the nations Capital, and certainly most unworthy as a Memorial to an Ex-President.

Most sincerely,

C. Paul Jennewein.

President.

CPJ/M.

FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION
MAR 6 1961
L. R. WILSON, SECRETARY
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

TELEPHONES:
PLAZA 6-1233-3660

Exhibit B-4

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DESIGN

1083 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 28, N.Y.

Founded 1825

Telephone ENright 9-4880

Officers

JOHN F. HARBESON
President

C. PAUL JENNEWEIN
1st Vice President

OGDEN M. PLEISSNER
2nd Vice President

LOUIS BOUCHE
Corresponding Secretary

HENRY GASSER
Recording Secretary

EDMONDO QUATTROCCHI
Asst. Corr. Secretary

WILLIAM PLATT
Treasurer

ELEANOR MELLON
Assistant Treasurer

Council

JUNIUS ALLEN

TORE ASPLUND

GILMORE D. CLARKE

PETER HELCK

BARSE MILLER

EUGENE SAVAGE

Director

VERNON C. PORTER

10 January 1961

Hon. David E. Finley
Chairman, National Commission of Fine Arts
C between 18th and 19th N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Council of the National Academy of Design has instructed me to inform you that the design which has been premiated in the competition for a memorial to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in Washington is unworthy as a memorial to an Ex-President, unworthy in design to be within visual relationship with the Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, unworthy in the material with which it is proposed to be built.

Very sincerely,

John Harbeson

John Harbeson
President

jfh/p

Exhibit B-5

23 January 1962

Dear Francis:

As you know, the members of the Commission want to give their most careful consideration to the proposed Pederson and Tilney design for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, which your Commission presented to them at our meeting on January 17th. They would like to have an opportunity to discuss the design on Tuesday morning, February 20th, with the architect and the sculptor and hope you will ask them to come at noon and meet with the members of the Commission in executive session.

I don't think it is necessary for you to be here on Tuesday, but hope that you will be able to attend the meeting the next day at ten o'clock, when we hope to be able to announce the decision to the press.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Francis Biddle
1669 31st Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

28 February 1962

Dear Mr. Tobriner:

I am writing to you in regard to a matter which has become a subject of increasing concern to the Commission of Fine Arts in recent months. I refer to statements made by officials of the District of Columbia Government which have attributed increased costs of District public works projects to the Commission of Fine Arts.

In a recent document entitled "State of the Nation's Capital 1962", which is a report to the Congress from the Board of Commissioners, there appears the following statement:

"Increased Costs

"In the matter of expenses, the District incurs increased costs over and above those incurred by an ordinary city because it is the Nation's Capital. Some examples of these increases follow:

1. The Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission require that most public works structures be designed to harmonize with the Federal Master Plan for the Capital City. It is estimated that the structure of the new Theodore Roosevelt Bridge will cost 2.5 million dollars or 33% extra, because of this. The Municipal Center is also an illustration of fine monumental construction consistent with such concepts. Furthermore, the delay in receiving concurrence of other agencies frequently defers construction which results in considerable additional costs." (page 1-2.16)

Another example of the tendency of District officials to cite the Commission of Fine Arts as being responsible for increased costs of public works projects occured recently when the Evening Star newspaper of 31 December 1961 carried an article on the lighting standards to be used on the new Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge. This article stated that special highway-type standards, costing $2,500 each, were to be used and that the special design was "to please the Fine Arts Commission." The facts are that the design in question was never approved by the Commission, which recommended instead that a much simpler type be used. Following publication of this story, the newspapers printed several letters criticizing the Commission for causing extravagant expenditures of public funds, and I was obliged to issue a statement to correct this impression.

Exhibit E

The members of the Commission believe that statements of this sort suborn the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts and create a distorted impression of the nature of the service that the Commission is authorized by the Congress to perform. The members of the Commission also feel that there are occasions when there seems to be a lack of sympathy, on the part of the District of Columbia officials, for the standards of design which should be applied in planning public works projects that will occupy important sites in the Nation's Capital.

For example, one of the greatest natural assets possessed by the city is the river landscape around Theodore Roosevelt Island and the riverside parks that extend northward from Arlington Memorial Bridge. The statement in the District Commissioner's report to Congress concerning an alleged 2.5 million dollars or 33% "extra" expense for the Roosevelt Bridge fails to recognize the intrinsic values of the area which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. The Commission believes it is obvious and imperative that any bridge constructed in this highly developed memorial area should be more than an ordinary steel span.

The approach of the District planners has often resulted in the "double-design" of District of Columbia public works projects, which has resulted in a needless waste of time and money. I refer to designs for projects that are not shown to the Commission of Fine Arts until a considerable amount of money has been invested in working drawings. Consequently, if the District Government accepts the recommendations of the Commission, these drawings frequently must be discarded and new drawings prepared. We cannot agree to accept responsibility for the added expense under these circumstances.

The Commission has repeatedly requested that projects be submitted at a preliminary stage so that the views of the Commission can be given before large sums of money are invested in unacceptable designs. We believe that this procedure would greatly assist both the District Government and the Commission to arrive at mutually satisfactory designs, and would also avoid much of the "delay" in receiving concurrence of other agencies to which the report to Congress also refers. Good design need not cost more than bad design, but it does require more study and understanding at an early stage.

The members of the Commission hope that the Board of Commissioners will instruct officials of the District Government to refrain from issuing public statements which tend to create the impression that the Commission of Fine Arts has "required" that design features be incorporated in public works projects, when, in fact, the Commission has recommended otherwise. We also hope that the Board will direct that the Commission be consulted on all District of Columbia public works projects at the earliest possible date of preliminary planning and certainly before working drawings are authorized.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Walter Tobriner
President
Board of Commissioners of the District
of Columbia
Washington 4, D.C.